

Redeemer Nation

America and the World in the Technocratic Age

1914 to the Present

Copyright © Orrin Schwab, 2004. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.



Published by
American University & Colleges Press™
American Book Publishing
P.O. Box 65624
Salt Lake City, UT 84165
<http://www.american-book.com>
Salt Lake City, Utah,

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper.

Redeemer Nation: America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Designed by Fabian Geyrhalt, design@american-book.com

Publisher's Note: *This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold or distributed with the understanding that the publisher and author is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional service. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person in a consultation capacity should be sought.*

ISBN 1-58982-190-4

Schwab, Orrin, Redeemer Nation: America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Special Sales

These books are available at special discounts for bulk purchases. Special editions, including personalized covers, excerpts of existing books, and corporate imprints, can be created in large quantities for special needs. For more information e-mail orders@american-book.com or call 801-486-8639.

Redeemer Nation

America and the World in the Technocratic Age

1914 to the Present

Orrin Schwab

Dedication

To the memory of David Schwab (1921–2002)

“Consider that we shall be as a City upon a Hill, the eyes of all people are upon us”

– John Winthrop

Preface

Redeemer Nation was conceived and written over a period of ten years. It represents the crystallization of my research and thought on modern American foreign relations and its relationship to the larger narrative of world history. Since the history of the United States constitutes all of modern times from the sixteenth century onward, the scope of this study encompasses far more than contemporary international historians typically ascribe to their subject area. In my mind, this book represents a comprehensive and coherent interpretation of both national and international history. I accept responsibility for explaining both, and will not apologize for covering too much ground in too little space.

The subject and the governing idea are certainly familiar. America, over four centuries, has conceived its national mission in terms of its cultural origins in Protestant British culture. For that reason, I have given it the name “redeemer nation.” Redemption, however, has always been a complicated matter that is directly related to who defines its meaning. To achieve salvation, the American nation-state has evolved with modern times, building a technocratic state and civilization dedicated to its own global realization.

The reader may wonder at my adoption of terms such as “technocratic,” “scripts,” and “epistemologies.” The first two chapters discuss these ideas in detail, building, hopefully, a coherent understanding of my analytical framework. I suggest that there are different components of historical agency that synthesize together according to the redemptive script for American society. The multilevel historical view of this synthesis represents my core argument in this work.

Ultimately, the reader shall determine what I add to the historical literature and to theory. Having trained as both a social scientist and as a historian, I have used an approach that attempts to bridge two disparate professional disciplines. I believe both types of professional observers can contribute insight and value to the understanding of history and the human condition.

The following glossary helps clarify the narrative:

Scripts: patterns of behavior followed by individuals or groups. Scripts are found throughout history.

Life scripts: scripts followed by individuals.

Institutional scripts: scripts followed by institutions.

National scripts: scripts followed by nation-states.

Metascripts: scripts found at the level of nation-states or civilizations that can span centuries or even millennia.

Western metascript: the script guiding the path of Western civilization as a global phenomenon in modern history.

Epistemologies: systems of knowledge specific to a particular subject or field of investigation.

Technocratic: technical knowledge, institutions, culture, scripts, or consciousness.

Technocratic epistemologies: systems of knowledge involving technocratic thought or knowledge.

Liberal technocratic order: the global institutional and ideological order defined by the culture of modern liberalism, capitalism, and scientific knowledge.

Technocratic internationalism: the ideology that supports the liberal technocratic order as a global political, cultural, institutional, and economic system.

Contents

Introduction.....	13
Narrative and Structure: The View from Space.....	13
Chapter I The Scripting of American Internationalism	33
A Comparative View of Collective Scripts.....	37
Scripts: Dramaturgy and Human History.....	42
Epistemologies: Knowledge Systems	46
Capitalism.....	49
Institutions: Organizational Systems	53
Public and Private Systems.....	54
The Market and the Corporate “Machine”.....	56
The State “Machine”: The “Military-Industrial Complex” or the “National Security State”	64
The Scripts and Metascripts.....	68
The Technocratic Script.....	73
America the Redeemer.....	76
Conclusion.....	81
Chapter II The Great War	83
Scripted Dimensions	83
The European Script: Nationalism and Technocracy.....	92
Nationalism and Imperialism.....	97
Wilsonianism: The American Script.....	105
Strategy: Coalition Warfare	109
Technocratic Institutions.....	115
American Internationalism: Technocratic Principles.....	117
The Russian Script.....	121
The Failure of the Liberal Script.....	125

Chapter III The Interwar System: 1919–1939.....	129
The Script Turns: Divergent Paths.....	129
Postwar Wilsonianism	133
Interwar Isolationism and Corporate Internationalism	144
The Great Depression	147
American Scripts	148
The Isolationist Script.....	151
Institutional Scripts.....	154
Intellectual Scripts	155
Isolationism vs. Internationalism: The American Epistemology for Global Affairs	156
The Technocratic Path: Nazi Germany.....	161
Lebensraum and Race: Nazi Ideology	163
Soviet Union: Stalinism and the International System	165
Japanese Imperialism: The East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere	168
Munich: The Appeasement Script	170
The Failures of the Liberal Metascript.....	171
Chapter IV Defending the Free World: The Technocratic War	175
The Technocratic War	176
The Metascript: The “Struggle for Power and Peace”	183
National Security State	190
War Production.....	193
War Epistemologies.....	194
The Manhattan Project.....	197
Postwar Planning	199
The Technocratic War Ends	200
Chapter V The Orthodox Cold War.....	205
The Cold War’s Metascript.....	205
Briefly: The Origins.....	215
Cold War Epistemology	221
The Beginning of the Orthodox Phase: The Children of Light.....	225
Orthodox Ideologies: Modes of Understanding.....	228
Technocratic Knowledge	234
Orthodox Containment	240
The Marshall Plan.....	242
Strategic Orthodoxy.....	244
Technocratic Science	247
Crises in the Orthodox Period.....	248
The East Asian Crises: Korea	249
Soviet and Chinese Scripts	251
The Korean Script.....	252

Indochina	254
China	256
European Crises: Berlin	259
The Middle East.....	260
Toward the New Frontier: Cuba, Laos, and Berlin 1960	261
 Chapter VI The Turn of the Script: Vietnam and the Anti–Cold War	265
The Rise of the Counterscript	265
The Missile Crisis	269
The Aftermath.....	272
Vietnam	273
The Intervention.....	274
Tet and Cambodia: The Denouement	279
Nixon	279
Post-Vietnam	283
The Carter Presidency.....	285
The New Script: Technocratic Development in the Revisionist Cold War	287
The New Culture.....	291
Toward the Reagan Revolution	295
Antecedents: American Decline	296
Reagan the Redeemer	298
 Chapter VII The Late Cold War: Communism’s Collapse.....	303
Regional Dimensions.....	309
Aspects of the Global Script: Political Economy.....	310
Epistemologies.....	311
Chronology	314
SDI: Strategic Defense Initiative	317
Conclusion: Human Freedom and the Technocratic Script	319
 Chapter VIII The Post–Cold War World: Toward the End of the Script?	323
The Post–Cold War World	323
The Liberal Design: Markets	328
The Impact of September 11.....	330
Contradictions in the Liberal Script.....	332
The Technocratic Machine	339
A New Technocratic Order: Toward a Cybernetic Civilization	340
The End of the Script?	343
 Index	347

Introduction

Narrative and Structure: The View from Space

The best world atlases show the earth starkly, as it really is and has been for millions of years. In detailed satellite images of the planet's surface, the physical reality of geology is apparent. Oceans and continents are shown from digital photos taken thousands of miles into space. The world viewed by human eyes from just a short distance, less than a tenth the distance to the moon, consists of colors and shapes. From the vantage of geosynchronous orbit, the oceans are deep blue and impenetrable. The continents are rough and silent. Their respective landmasses are mixtures of colors that reveal certain basic characteristics of climatology. The colors show the presence and intensity of vegetation, ice, and water. The Sahara and almost the entire northern half of Africa, as well as all of southwestern Asia, are different hues of brown. Equatorial Africa, Europe, and most of the Americas are green. The richest greens are in the Amazon and the rain forests of the Congo. The polar ice capes are absolutely enormous, stretching for thousands of miles. One can only wonder at the possibility of their expansion, or, more likely, their disappearance.¹

What is most interesting to the historian is what the images do not show. Just a short ride into outer space and the artifacts of human existence are hidden. A completely naive observer, looking at those images, would never guess that civilizations ever existed. There is no New York, Tokyo, Beijing, London, Paris, or Buenos Aires. The United States, its political map so familiar, does not exist. Nor do any other political boundaries, or evidence of human impact of any kind. From the vantage point of space, there was no Renaissance or Middle Ages in Europe. The river valley civilizations never happened. The pyramids do not exist. The Great Wall of China, the city of Jerusalem, the Vatican, the palaces of European royalty, the libraries of all the great world universities—all are now gone. Thousands of years of history, and the present material culture of computers,

¹The 21st Century World Atlas (*Naples, FL: Trident International Press, 1998*).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

cell phones, lasers, nuclear physics, and biotechnology—all have disappeared from the face of the planet. Despite what may be the unique and extraordinary accomplishments of advanced technological civilization, the species is invisible. It would seem that no matter what humans will do, the continents and the oceans will remain. When the human species leaves the earth, larger geological structures of the physical world will be as they were.²

The satellite photos suggest fundamental truths about the nature of human civilizations. Indeed, they are truths that historians and social scientists grapple with continuously but sometimes forget. First, and above all, what constitutes society and culture is what we imagine. From space, the observed physical reality is that nation-states do not exist. Nor do the thousands of languages, religions, stories, myths, visual and cinematic art, music, scientific artifacts, and whatever else constitutes our collective reality as a species. All of what we are is quite transient. Every aspect of human culture and history must be specific to time and place. Virtually all that we are as historical beings exists within our individual and collective consciousness, “the semiotic web,” as described by Clifford Geertz.³ Perhaps the future will be different, dominated by new generations of machine intelligence, but looking at the human past, indeed only a small fraction of that past recorded history, all that has been civilization has been ephemeral. The Greek city-state, medieval Florence, the Song dynasty of a thousand years ago, eighteenth-century Europe, the American “frontier”—all have become images, reconstructions of what they were. All civilizations become transparent. They are buried underneath the foundations of new human cultures, often erased from public memory and history. Nonetheless, the transparent and ephemeral nature of human existence survives. Each generation inherits the knowledge and mentalities that are imparted from its culture. Each one inherits the cognitive and emotional attachments of its collective history. All of this constitutes a societal script, woven intricately into the hugely complex system of global human community.⁴ In trying to interpret world or national history, or the history

²Recent scientific thought suggests the uniqueness of human life, as well as its accidental and ephemeral nature. See Peter D. Ward and Donald Brownie, *Rare Earth: Why Complex Life Is Uncommon in the Universe* (New York: Copernicus, 2000); Stephen Jay Gould, *Ever Since Darwin: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Norton, 1992); Edward O. Wilson, *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge* (New York: Knopf, 1998).

³Sherry B. Ortner, ed., *The Fate of Culture: Geertz and Beyond* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 7, and *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

⁴Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974); Victor Turner and Edward Bruner, eds., *The Anthropology of Experience* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986). *Historians have created the field of public history, which explores culture as by definition the historical “memory” of a society. See Pierre Nora, Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past, 3 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996–1998); John Bodnar, Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration and Patriotism (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992); John R. Gillis,*

Introduction

of any community, we recover what was always invisible from space. We use the idiosyncratic methods of historical investigation, and we discover narrative and structure. How does the narrative relate to the structures that define it? These structures or factors are physical, intellectual, and historical. How then does the recovered narrative effect the integration of its actors with the other essential accoutrements of the drama? In other words, why does anything happen the way it does? This is a presumptive question that all historians must answer either directly or implicitly. For historians of political, military, and international history, who deal with untestable patterns of action, most often at different levels of analysis, the answers have almost always been by definition conjectural.⁵

One may only sample some of the questions that historians and their students contemplate, both in the classroom and at reading desks situated in archival centers all over the world. In early American history, for example, what indeed led to the American Revolution, and why, given all the difficulties, did it succeed? Why did the Confederacy lose in its bid for independence? And why, in the twentieth century, was Hitler possible? Further, why were Lenin and Stalin possible as radical heirs to the Romanovs? In the military history of the Second World War, why did Hitler fail to defeat Great Britain in 1940, and Stalin fail to prepare for Hitler's invasion in 1941? Why too was the United States a victim at Pearl Harbor? Why did Western Europe not turn communist in the direct aftermath of the Second World War, and why or how did the Marshall Plan succeed? How was it possible for Japan to rebuild itself, and why, given its history, did the Japanese remain part of the West?⁶

ed., *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).

⁵Historiography, the philosophy of history, and historicism are topics of consuming interest for all who write history. Of course, in the post-positivist present, there can never be an objective understanding of the past. See Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Association* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988); see draft papers from Rice University symposium on the philosophy of history: John H. Zammito, "Historicism, Metahistory, and Historical Practice: 'The Historicization of the Historical Subject,'" *History and the Limits of Interpretation: A Symposium*, www.ruf.rice.edu/~culture/papers/Zammito.html, and Jörn Rüsen, "Narrativity and Objectivity in Historical Studies," www.ruf.rice.edu/~culture/papers/Rusen.html.

⁶Counterfactual history is now both a literary and an academic field with Web sites and discussion groups. Discussion of the subject and its value or lack thereof has been a point of contention in English-language historical literature from the beginning of the twentieth century. See J. C. Squire, ed., *If It Had Happened Otherwise: Lapses into Imaginary History* (London: Longmans, Green, 1931); F. J. C. Hearnshaw, *The "Ifs" of History* (London: George Newnes, 1929). For modern speculations, see Niall Ferguson, *Virtual History: Alternatives and Counterfactuals* (Picador, 1996); Kenneth Macksey, *Hitler Options: Alternate Decisions of World War II* (Mechanicsburg, PA: Greenhill/Stackpole, 1995); and especially the recent collection, Robert Cowley, ed., *What If? The World's Foremost Military Historians Imagine What Might Have Been* (New York: G. Putnam's Sons, 1999).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The intention of most narrative historians has been to eschew most theories of historical process. Factors, components of a complex explanation, are given emphasis as causes in history. Yet, the causes describe only general theories of why events happen. The essence of causality in history implies indeterminacy. In a descriptive historical narrative, the agency of individuals and particular conditions or circumstances become reasons for historical events. Therefore, George Washington's leadership was instrumental in the creation of the American republic. His particular actions, both military and political, were critical to the survival of the country. A political historian of the American Revolution and early republic may be satisfied with that explanation. He may integrate the actions of George Washington into the context of a society determined to change. It was, then, not only the actions of George Washington, but also the work of his entire generation of leaders that allowed for the genesis of the United States. Yet, in this explanation, there remains no overarching view of American society as a product of the longer process of the Enlightenment, or of the agency of George Washington as part of a scripted process of social change. To the narrative historian focused on the biographical, Washington's agency is genuine. The great leader's path was unclear and uncertain as he fought his way through the battles of the American Revolutionary War. It remained clouded all the way to the presidency of the republic. In this narrative view, still common among political historians, the structure of American history remains opaque.⁷

Historians who reject broad social scientific explanations may view much of what happens in human history as having been accidental. It was an accident, a chance of circumstances, that Washington's army survived the winter of 1776–1777, even if we consider the great leader's determination. It was entirely the interplay of personalities and various historical "factors" that led to the outcome at Yorktown in 1781. From the perspective of many traditional narrative historians, popular theories of collective action used by social scientists oversimplify their subjects. The complexity of human beings and human civilization militates against "scientific" or analytical models for history. As a general rule, all narrative historians, whether tending toward analytical or descriptive history writing, view their discipline as multicausal, nonlinear, and essentially

⁷Burke Davis, *George Washington and the American Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1975); Paul K. Longmore, *The Invention of George Washington* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 184–211; Forrest McDonald, "Today's Indispensable Man" in Gary L. Gregor and Matthew Spalding, eds., *Patriot Sage: George Washington and the American Political Tradition* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 1999), 24–37; William Sterne Randall, *George Washington: A Life* (New York: Henry Holt, 1997), 398–99; James Thomas Flexner, *George Washington in the American Revolution (1775–1783)* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), 531–52. Assessing Washington's extraordinary career, Flexner wrote:

...he accepted his preeminence as naturally as a man accepts his right hand. He did not even seem conscious of how powerful he was, how grievously he out dazzled those around him. All the more because it was so effortless, this dominance made enemies of men who considered themselves as good as he was, or better—or who disapproved of his opinions. And some historians, more used to contemporary patterns, have assumed that because he did not struggle for office Washington was a clod-like puppet lifted by brute chance. (p. 551)

Introduction

nonquantifiable, even in the age of technocratic social scientific methods. This does not make narrative “unscientific.”⁸

For physical scientists and mathematicians, randomness as cause makes perfect sense. In natural history, the randomness of evolution has long been accepted. To evolutionary biologists, the chance introduction of *Homo sapiens* onto the evolutionary map of hominids, a simple random variation in phylogeny some several hundred thousand years ago, is the best scientific explanation. For physicists, the indeterminate nature of quantum fluctuations remains essential. Yet, randomness in science is also related to theories of macro-scale and micro-scale change. Quantum fluctuations are part of a theory of how matter is organized in the universe. The fact that a proton’s behavior must be random does not mean that the universe as a physical system does not obey laws of order as well as chaos. Similarly, the changes that biologists see in populations and ecosystems are random on one level, but in the longer systemic view they fit into models for population growth and evolutionary change.⁹ In contrast, narrative historians, however committed to the chance nature of historical events, usually do not have a general theory of why anything happens or should happen. Washington founded the republic, but there was nothing that ordained his success or translated it into a grand theory of historical change. To understand the past as ordered or predictable, so the argument goes, suggests an ahistorical view of human events.¹⁰

⁸Alan Megill explicitly rejects the idea that history is causal at all. The “explanatory bias,” as he terms it, reflects the effect of Newtonian physics on historical practice. History, then, should avoid cause and effect summations and remain a purely narrative discipline. See Alan Megill, “Recounting the Past: ‘Description,’ Explanation, and Narrative in Historiography,” *American Historical Review* 94, no. 3 (June 1989): 627–53. The international historian remains keen on the appreciation of randomness versus structure. Bruce Cumings analogized the complexities of snowflake research with the historian’s craft:

Snowflake research has yielded mathematical models that seek to bring together and analyze forces that create and give predictability to the six-legged structure, and also that destabilize it—“large-scale processes and microscopic processes”...in spite of the advance of science, the “large scale processes” remain unknown, or at least unpredictable...each political event is both structured and random; each is both regular and unpredictable; each sums up the history it has experienced and goes beyond it; each is subject to unpredictable interventions called choices; each comes from a particular field, and each event, piled on another, also creates a political field; each can be dissected and understood, but only in retrospect. (Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War*, vol.2, *The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947–1950* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 4.

⁹Murray Gell-Mann, *The Quark and the Jaguar: Adventures in the Simple and the Complex* (New York: W. H. Freeman, 1995); Stuart Kauffman, *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

¹⁰Megill, *Recounting the Past*, 632; Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War*, vol. 1, *Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes, 1945–1947*. (New York: Columbia, 1981), 3–12; Louis O. Mink, “The Autonomy of Historical Understanding,” in Brian Fay, Eugene O. Golob, and Richard T. Vann, eds., *Louis O. Mink: Historical Understanding* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 61–88.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Narrating the past without structure, however, lends itself inevitably to the same ahistoricity. Without structure, or a theory of why things happen, past events have no genuine meaning. I submit that there is nothing of any value in knowing George Washington's intent and behaviors while president without a general concept or theory of his place in history. What structures within American and international history bear upon George Washington as a historical figure? If George Washington was like all other human beings in his time and in ours, he was following a life script, a program for his behavior passed down to him by his family, his culture, and the political dynamics of his role. Further, that role was synchronized and orchestrated by the forces within society that make George Washingtons as well as Woodrow Wilsons and Franklin Roosevelts, and, for that matter, Adolf Hitlers and Joseph Stalins.

The debate, then, as we view the world from twenty thousand miles in space, remains one between randomness and structure. Random conditions or events, to some degree, explain the Russian Revolution as not only subject to the "causes" of revolutionary times, but to the happenstance of a chain of events that led to just the right conditions for Lenin to assume power. Perhaps if one of those conditions, such as Lenin's safe arrival in Russia in 1916, had not occurred, then the communist takeover and the resulting Soviet state would never have materialized.¹¹ Similarly, the Nazi revolution of 1933 was not predestined by the structural realities of German history in the 1920s and early 1930s. Perhaps if the Nazi party had gone bankrupt, as it almost did at the end of 1932, Hitler would not have been made chancellor in 1933. Further, if someone who died in the trenches of the First World War had not died, Hitler might have been eclipsed by another figure with similar but yet different designs for German resurgence.¹²

Counterfactual history is inexplicable and not taken seriously by professional historians other than as an exercise for understanding cause and effect. However, possibilities for alternative chronologies militate against the idea of a teleological view of historical process. That the flapping of the wings of a butterfly, according to the most famous example of complexity theory, can "cause" a hurricane, supports the argument for the random and almost atheoretical nature of historical cause and effect. In this view of history, the structures identified by analytical historians as causing an event or process do not and cannot explain human history in its entirety. Structural explanations of history that posit such things as political ideology, other mentalities, events, and economic,

¹¹Lenin's "indomitable will," ruthlessness, and political genius made him the quintessential agent for the Bolshevik Revolution. See Michael Kort, *The Soviet Colossus: History and Aftermath* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2001), 58–70; Hélène Carrère d'Encausse, *Lenin* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 2001), 201–29; John Reed, *Ten Days That Shook the World* (1922; reprint, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books, 1977).

¹²Ian Kershaw, *Hitler 1889–1936: Hubris* (New York: Norton, 1998) and *Hitler, 1936–45: Nemesis* (New York: Norton, 2000); William Carr, *Hitler: A Study in Personality and Politics* (London: Edward Arnold, 1978); Fritz Redlich, *Hitler: Diagnosis of a Destructive Prophet* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); George Victor, *Hitler: The Pathology of Evil* (Washington, DC: Brassey's, 1998); Ron Rosenbaum, *Explaining Hitler: The Search for the Origins of His Evil* (New York: Random House, 1998).

strategic, or political interests can only point to or suggest a framework for understanding the past.¹³

Analytical approaches to the past that emphasize the structures or conditions that inform historical events are naturally hostile to short-term atheoretical interpretations. In the view of some world historians, processes exist over centuries and traverse regional cultures. The classical historians and philosophers of history of the modern period, among them Kant, Hegel, Marx, Weber, Spengler, and Toynbee, viewed history as following teleological paths. They defined history as following a course, a structure determined alternatively by nature, God, technology, culture, biology, or historical laws. Human history, as understood by these thinkers, was structured. In Kant and Hegel, the future lay in the revelation of a natural order; in Marx, Weber, Spengler, and Toynbee, civilizations followed certain paths, destinies that were defined by economic laws, social development, and human cultures.¹⁴

In more recent historiography, world history has developed more modern analytical paradigms. Global change, according to the famous French *Annales* school of Bloch, Lefebvre, and Braudel, established commerce and capitalism as essential structures in modern world history. The successors to these thinkers, the world systems theorists of the late twentieth century—Wallerstein and Frank, among others—extended the notion of world commerce to the economic structures of global capitalism acting upon nation-states. The modern world systems theories understand historical continuity over centuries, if not millennia. Long-range projections for human history, such as the one proposed by the modern world systems school, view the dynamics of capitalism as a global system determining most of what has happened over the last several thousand years. In modern history, this view interprets the concept of the nation-state as a production system dedicated to the expansion of the cosmopolitan core. In twentieth-century history, the global “imperium” was led by elite groups, primarily agents of the upper class in the United States and elsewhere in the core, whose powers emanated from effective control of the state. Alternatively, in the view of non-Marxist world historians,

¹³*Complexity theorists tend to endorse the idea of narrative indeterminacy:*

Unstable or aperiodic systems are unable to resist small disturbances and will display complex behavior, making prediction impossible and measurements will appear random. Human history is an excellent example of aperiodic behavior. Civilization may appear to rise and fall, but things never happen in the same way. Small events or single personalities may change the world around them. (Judy Petree, “Chaos without the Math,” part 3: “Strange Attractor in Chaos Theory,” <http://www.wfu.edu/~petrejh4/Attractor.htm>.)

¹⁴Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Philosophy of History* (New York: Dover, 1956); Frederick C. Beiser, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Arnold Toynbee, *Mankind and Mother Earth: A Narrative History of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

the role of ecology and technological expansion explain the long-term progression of civilizations. In these explanations, structure is everything.¹⁵

In twentieth-century history, especially international history, the dichotomy remains between postmodernist and realist interpretations of the contemporary age. Randomness versus structure—the relative value of facts and events over paradigmatic assumptions and explanations—remains an element of rivalry and dispute. In the scientific global history approaches pioneered by McNeill, Crosby, and Diamond, geographical and ecological factors structure the path of historical change. Instead of viewing the world capitalist system as the independent variable, these global historians have suggested other macro historical factors. The development of regional and world cultures is related to the geography of continents; the transfer of viruses, plants, and other flora and fauna in cross-cultural exchanges; and the technological changes that establish the supremacy of one culture over others. This argument suggests that European domination of world civilization from the nineteenth century onward was a result of particular structural factors related to the ecology and geography of Europe vis-à-vis surrounding regions.¹⁶

Structural explanations of twentieth-century internationalism are prominent in the field I was trained in: the diplomatic history of the Cold War. The corpus of American scholarship on the Cold War includes carefully written and documented narratives that expound upon the dynamics of the Washington foreign policy establishment. In this literature, several schools or approaches have been developed that explore the overall nature of American internationalism and its structural characteristics with respect to the international system. Among these ideological views are corporatism and realism.¹⁷

¹⁵Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th–18th Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); Lucien Febvre, *A Geographical Introduction to History* (New York: Knopf, 1925); Lucien Febvre, *A New Kind of History: From the Writings of Febvre*, ed. Peter Burke (London: Routledge, 1973); Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967); Andre Gunder Frank, *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974); Immanuel Wallerstein, *Historical Capitalism with Capitalist Civilization* (London: Verso, 1995); Cumings, *The Roaring of the Cataract*.

¹⁶William H. McNeill, *The Age of Gunpowder Empires, 1450–1800* (Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1989); William H. McNeill, *The Global Condition: Conquerors, Catastrophes, and Community* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992); William H. McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1976); Alfred W. Crosby, *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1972); Alfred W. Crosby, *Germs, Seeds and Animals: Studies in Ecological History* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1994); Jared Diamond, *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies* (New York: Norton, 1997); Sheldon Watts, *Epidemics and History: Disease, Power and Imperialism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997).

¹⁷For realism, see especially John Gaddis, *The United States and the End of the Cold War: Implications, Reconsiderations, Provocations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). For corporatism, see Bruce Cumings, “Revising Post Revisionism, or, The Poverty of Theory in U.S.

The corporatist view of American internationalism sees the state as a coherent entity, interrelated with private-sector interests. In the view of later corporatist historians, Michael Hogan and others, the American state shaped foreign policy according to the managerial necessities of Cold War capitalism. The Marshall Plan, underwritten by a congressional majority that was leading itself away from an expansive Rooseveltian internationalism, was a necessary political economy program to shape postwar Europe in the image of the United States. However, in light of the structures of political and economic interests that influenced the planning, it was Europe that made its postwar self in its own image. Nonetheless, Hogan argued that the Marshall Plan was a critical component for the formation of the national security state, which had developed into a coherent entity by the early 1950s.¹⁸ Dedicated to the preservation of global capitalism and the deterrence of international communism, the institutional system of the Cold War anchored the free world through strategic containment and a managed international political economy.

Structural interpretations of the Cold War are legion. The institutional history of the Cold War is of quintessential importance to its historical understanding. The “national security state” was a concept that resonated with American intellectuals during the 1960s and 1970s.¹⁹ Its potent image and unambiguous meaning explained in part the direction the country took with respect to the Vietnam War. During the last decade of the Cold

Diplomatic History,” in Michael J. Hogan, ed., *America in the World: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations since 1941* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 20–62.

¹⁸Michael J. Hogan, *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947–1952* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Michael J. Hogan, *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

¹⁹See C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956); Fred Cook, *The Warfare State* (New York: Collier Books, 1962); Adam Yarmolinsky, *The Military Establishment: Its Impact on American Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972); Gene M. Lyons and Louis Morton, *Schools for Strategy, Education and Research in National Security Affairs* (New York: Praeger, 1965); Paul Dickson, *Think Tanks* (New York: Atheneum, 1971); Marcus G. Raskin, *The Politics of National Security* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1979); Richard J. Barnet, *The Economy of Death* (New York: Atheneum, 1969) and *Roots of War* (New York: Atheneum, 1972); Franz Schurmann, *The Logic of World Power: An Inquiry into the Origins, Currents and Contradictions of World Politics* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1974); William H. Read, *America’s Mass Media Merchants* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976). In addition to Hogan’s *A Cross of Iron*, a newer institutional literature written by historians has begun to explore the subject of the national security state, but the focus is primarily on its institutional history. See Gregory Hooks, *Forging the Military-Industrial Complex: World War II’s Battle of the Potomac* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991); Benjamin Franklin Cooling, *Complex Gray Steel and Blue Water Navy: The Formative Years of America’s Military-Industrial Complex, 1881–1917* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1979); Harvey M. Sapolsky, *Science and the Navy: The History of the Office of Naval Research* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990); Stuart W. Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

War, other highly regarded American diplomatic historians, most notably Melvyn Leffler and John Gaddis, advanced somewhat different state-centered explanations for the Cold War and American foreign policy. Leffler's study of the Truman administration, published in 1992, interpreted American policy as motivated by the national security objective to "maintain the core," namely, Western Europe within the strategic alliance against the Soviets. The industrial core, in Leffler's interpretation, represented an American view of its vital interest in world affairs. Protecting that core ensured, in American eyes, that Soviet influence would be held in check.²⁰

Gaddis, whose work spanned the Cold War in its entirety, took a structural view that subsumed political economy as secondary to military force.²¹ His perspective understood the Cold War as almost entirely a strategic rivalry. Power, nuclear and conventional, implemented by successive "strategies of containment," explained the basic nature of the behavior of the superpowers. Working exclusively with American sources and understanding the binational relationship with respect to American strategic doctrine, Gaddis viewed American policy as either "asymmetric" (selective) or "symmetric" (uniform) in nature. In Gaddis's view, there are "lumpers" and "splitters" in historical research. The splitters never arrive at a general synthesis, and indeed are opposed to the idea of one. "Lumpers" like him, in contrast, build grand designs, emphasizing the integrity of repetitive actions and strategies by international actors.²² In a later work, summing up his career as a Cold War historian and paying tribute to the "new Cold War history" being produced by a younger generation of historians, Gaddis's views of the conflict had changed somewhat. Rather than positing a deterministic view of structure founded upon "geopolitical codes," as he had suggested in the early 1980s, fifteen years later he concluded that cause and effect in history were always contingent and "multidimensional." In this revised explanation, the international history of the twentieth century was founded on both the structure of realist analysis—that is, national self-

²⁰Melvyn P. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), 500–1.

²¹John Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); John Gaddis, *The Long Peace: Inquiries into the History of the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); John Gaddis, *The United States and the End of the Cold War. John Gaddis summed up a professional lifetime of Cold War history research in What We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

²²This was Gaddis's argument:

This book is an effort to redress the balance in favor of "lumping."...it approaches its subject, not from the more traditional diplomatic, economic or military perspectives, but from an angle of vision that I think incorporates all of these: that of strategy. By "strategy," I mean quite simply the process by which ends are related to means, intentions to capabilities, and objectives to resources. (Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, viii)

interests—and the caprice of leaders who externalized their neuroses onto world politics. Gaddis, of course, was referring to Stalin.²³

The objective of this narrative is similar with respect to the idea of structure in foreign policy and international relations. However, my concept of structure is quite different. I have reexamined the nature of American foreign relations within the context of both twentieth-century international and U.S. history, and viewed such history as largely determined by a complex structure that exists everywhere in human society. The idea underlying this narrative is to consider American society and its relationship to the world in the past century as a structured but layered design in which the instrumental and the structural are linked by the concept of scripts, and in particular, the technocratic script of the twentieth century. Although radical in interpretation, the text is chronological. It moves forward through the readily identifiable periods of twentieth-century international history, from the First World War to the present. The story begins with the advent of Wilsonian internationalism, when the United States became a dominant global force, and ends in the contemporary era with the current hegemonic force of Americanism embracing the technological revolutions and the new technocratic internationalism of the twenty-first century.²⁴

However traditional the chronological approach may be, the interpretive framework is, substantially, new and idiosyncratic. It represents my particular synthesis of social science and humanist paradigms for the understanding of national and international history. The narrative moves with strong linear concepts of the development of institutions, leaderships, and systems of knowledge. It endeavors to explain the scripted behavior of elite groups and individuals, from Woodrow Wilson through the presidencies of the early post-Cold War era. The topic, the path of American internationalism, required focus on the major crises and transformations of the century. The analysis includes the Great Depression, the Second World War, and the nuclear and nonnuclear crises of the extended Cold War. Finally, the narrative concludes with an analytical view of the emergence of the post-Cold War world in the last decade of the century and the contemporary period. This study has been conceived as an ambitious work, demanding a rigorous and creative view of modern history, and is provocative and radical, in some ways, in its approach to the subject.

²³Gaddis, *What We Now Know*, 281–95. *For a very different perspective on the Cold War, one that rejects Gaddis's work almost in its entirety, see Cumings, The Roaring of the Cataract and Parallax Visions: Making Sense of East Asian Relations at the End of the Century (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999).*

²⁴*For the impact of Woodrow Wilson's ideology on the twentieth century, see Frank Ninkovich, Modernity and Power: A History of the Domino Theory in the Twentieth Century (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) and The Wilsonian Century: U.S. Foreign Policy since 1900 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). Recent syntheses on twentieth-century international history include Eric Hobsbawm, The Age of Extremes: A History of the World, 1914–1991 (London: M. Joseph, 1994); John Lukacs, The End of the Twentieth Century and the End of the Modern Age (New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1993); John Grenville, A History of the World in the Twentieth Century (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000).*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The book's historical synthesis, advanced for American international history, lends a very different treatment to the twentieth-century era than what has been written by most diplomatic historians. Deliberately, this work is intended as more than just a diplomatic or political history of American foreign relations. Instead, I have developed an analytical narrative that interprets twentieth-century international American history within the context of several unique constructs. I have used the terms "scripts," "epistemologies," and "technocratic" to interpret modern history and American culture and institutions in particular. In broad terms, the devices, metaphors, or constructs that I have used all concern the concept of a technocratic civilization. In the idea of a technocratic modern world, the organizing principles of science, industrial capitalism, and the political ideologies of nation-states coalesce into a structured global narrative. In the modern technocratic world, scripted patterns of national behavior have created a contemporary chronology of crises and resolutions, of chaos and disaster juxtaposed with order and stability.²⁵

As used in this text, the term "technocratic" carries several meanings. First, the idea refers to an abstract notion of technology. The concepts of technology and technocratic are similar, but are not identical. In effect, technologies of various kinds are tools of the technocratic.²⁶ Technology may be defined as physical or intellectual in nature, although in the last analysis, all physical aspects of technology are connected to its intellectual construction, while intellectual technologies, such as technical fields of knowledge, are almost always manifested in some way in physical terms. Physical technology is easy enough to understand. The tools that sparked the agricultural revolution in eighteenth-century Europe and the machines that started the factory system were physical technologies that can be seen and held in human hands. Intellectual technology, however, does not have a physical presence, although it may have enormous effects on civilizations. Physical technology in the form of cannons, rifles, and wagons enabled the armies of Napoleon. Napoleon's grand strategy, however, which existed only in his mind and in the ink of his planning documents, was also technology. The technologies for

²⁵The architect and historian Lewis Mumford developed the technological theory of history. See *Technics and Civilization* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1934) and *Myth of the Machine: The Pentagon of Power* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1970).

²⁶Jacques Ellul, *The Technological Society* (New York: Vintage Books, 1964); Daniel Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting* (New York: Basic Books, 1973); Yoneji Masuda, *The Information Society as Post-Industrial Society* (Tokyo: Institute for the Information Society, 1980); James R. Beniger, *The Control Revolution: Technological and Economic Origins of the Information Society* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986); Taichi Sakaiya, trans. George Fields and William Marsh, *The Knowledge-Value Revolution, or, A History of the Future* (New York: Kodansha International, 1991); Peter Drucker, *Post-Capitalist Society* (New York: Harper Business, 1993); Matthew Friedman, *Fuzzy Logic: Dispatches from the Information Revolution* (Montreal: Vehicule Press, 1997); Manuel Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000); Gabriel Brahm Jr. and Mark Driscoll, eds., *Prosthetic Territories: Politics and Hypertechnologies* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995); Wendy Currie, *The Global Information Society* (New York: Wiley, 2000).

building the industrial systems of the nineteenth and twentieth century were also intellectual, although their physical reality became apparent in the railroads, steel mills, power plants, skyscrapers, motor vehicles, and electronic telecommunications systems that they produced. Further, even the abstract theories of scientists became technology. Einstein's theory of relativity became an intellectual technology when it was applied to the real world. The "Little Boy" which exploded over Hiroshima in 1945 was both a physical technology, evidenced by its massive destructive effect, and also a manifestation of the intellectual technology of the new field of nuclear engineering. Further, the post-World War II expansion of knowledge in all of the applied sciences, from clinical psychology, sociology, economics, and business administration, to the post-Cold War sciences of genomics, proteomics, and nanotechnology, resulted in the geometric expansion of technology, divorced from the physical world. Instead, the manufacture of ideas became the most salient function of postindustrial technocratic civilization.²⁷

Technocratic civilization should be defined as the creation of societies dedicated to the production of increasingly complex physical and intellectual technologies. All technology should be referenced as part of a technical civilization and its institutional systems. Whether these technologies are steam locomotives, steel mills, computer chips, or the economic science of John Maynard Keynes, Milton Friedman, or Karl Marx, they should be considered technocratic. The physical and mental aspects of human technologies are integrated parts of each technocratic society and civilization. "Technocratic knowledge" may be social science, physical or natural science, or any technical field or discipline that uses systematic, quantitative measurements. I have termed organized systems of knowledge as epistemologies. Technocratic epistemologies, or what I have also called "epistemological systems," are one central component of technocratic societies. The other component is institutions. Institutions organized into "institutional systems" and connected to technocratic knowledge define what I have termed as technocratic.²⁸

²⁷I use epistemology as a term for the construction of knowledge into an organized system of knowing within a particular political, social, and historical context. Philosophers understand this as a theory of social epistemology. See Alvin Goldman's review essay "Social Epistemology" at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology-social/> (copyright 2001) and Alvin Goldman, *Knowledge in a Social World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). With respect to institutions, the field of organizational behavior that crosses the social and policy sciences is quintessentially a technocratic system of knowledge. Modern corporate and public sector institutions are structured according to the engineered characteristics of the technocratic epistemology of organizational or management science. See, for example, Anant R. Negandhi, ed., *Modern Organizational Theory: Contextual, Environmental, and Socio-Cultural Variables* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1973); Henry L. Tosi, Neal P. Mero, and John R. Rizzo, *Managing Organizational Behavior*, 4th ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Business, 2000).

²⁸Historical studies of a managed institutional society include David F. Noble, *America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism* (New York: Knopf, 1977); Samuel Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973); Stephen P. Waring, *Taylorism Transformed:*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

With respect to American history, technocratic culture has been central and, in the most modern period, preponderant in its influence. The scientific-industrial revolutions of Western history are the path, for technocratic knowledge and culture that connects directly to America's role in modern history. Therefore, in order to fully understand the United States in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, as a great power and as a cosmopolitan society, we must come to terms with the foundations and meanings of the technocratic, within Western and, in particular, American culture. Technocracy has everything to do with knowledge—its acquisition, development, uses, and meanings. It has meant the proliferation and refinement of technocratic institutions and their development, powers, and interrelationships.²⁹

Finally, I introduce the concept of scripts. Scripts have governed the technocratic organization of American culture and society during the last century. Scripts are narratives that relate to patterns of conduct. They create the dramaturgy of a group, institution, or culture. The dynamics of scripts will be defined and described in much detail. I introduce the key terms, namely, scripts, metascripts, epistemologies, knowledge systems, technocratic, liberal technocratic, and others, as I build the narrative. The resulting portrait of modern times that emerges from this scholarly text will be a complex and challenging one. Hopefully, it will be compelling as well as provocative and will facilitate a reasoned examination of the nature of global and national processes of change as I have shown them. I should expect a wide range of opinion on my interpretation, and I am not afraid of the risk carried by an attempt at a sweeping and thoroughly unconventional view of modern history.

For reasons that I will explain, I have named my subject the redeemer nation. This has been done because of America's own thematic self-definition. In terms of their own cultural identity, America and Americans have always imagined themselves as redeemers. To redeem, in Judeo-Christian religion, means to achieve salvation from God. To be redeemed, in American culture, has always been associated with actions related to achieving what God wants from his people. In America, this has meant a society that governs itself according to God's law—namely, a society that has spread the Judeo-Christian truths about monotheism and the community of all peoples. American

Scientific Management Theory since 1945 (*Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991*); Daniel Nelson, ed., *A Mental Revolution: Scientific Management since Taylor* (*Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1992*); J.-C. Spender and Hugo J. Kijne, eds., *Scientific Management: Frederick Winslow Taylor's Gift to the World?* (*Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996*). Books on "technocracy" date to the early 1930s. See Wayne Parrish, *An Outline of Technocracy* (*New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1933*); James Parkin, *Public Management: Technocracy, Democracy and Organizational Reform* (*Brookfield, VT: Avebury, 1994*); see note 24.

²⁹This returns us to the questions of the social construction of knowledge and the use of technical and scientific knowledge by the modern state in support of global interests. See Lewis Mumford, *The Myth of the Machine*, vol. 2, *The Pentagon of Power* (*New York: Harcourt & Brace, 1967*); Ron Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Intellectual Complex* (*Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001*); Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*, 1–22, 209–64.

historiography has shown these aspects of redemption or worldly mission in plenitude.³⁰ Americans are heirs to the Western and specifically Protestant culture that has compelled society to impart a sense of mission, a path for the righteous against the evil inflicted upon the world. The mission adopted by groups and individuals has been religious, as the country preserved traditional religious forms throughout the twentieth century. Yet, importantly, the sense of mission has also been secular. Mission in American society and culture is so ubiquitous it is often unrecognized. It has often been transformed into something thoroughly materialistic, commercial, and self-centered. Still, redemption as a cultural desire remains quintessential to Americans and Americanism.³¹

At the national level, the original concept of religious mission remains sublimated in the collective actions of the nation-state. Mission requires a belief in exceptionalism, and the historiography of American foreign relations has been replete with description and analysis of American belief in its exceptionalist mission to the world. From the founding generation of the late eighteenth century through all the patriotic rhetoric of nineteenth-century America, including the idea of Manifest Destiny in the 1840s and Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg, and through the age of imperialism, including the building of the Panama Canal at the turn of the twentieth century, the primacy and success of American destiny has been its redemption. Redemption, however, is always in the eye of the beholder. America was redeemed in its success against its adversaries, and in the expansion of its society, irrespective of its political and economic contradictions. Americans during the twentieth century retained the script to expand Americanism and to build the liberal technocratic order that combined parliamentary forms of democracy with multinational capitalism. Through the rhetoric of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt,

³⁰Daniel T. Rodgers, "Exceptionalism," in Gordon S. Wood and Anthony Molho, eds., *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), 3–25; Dorothy Ross, "Grand Narrative in Nineteenth Century America," *American Historical Review* (October 1989): 909–28; Frederick Merck, *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation* (New York: Knopf, 1963); Robert W. Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

³¹Millenarianism has been characteristic of American culture for four hundred years. It has a long tradition integral to the Western grand narrative or metascript. W. Clark Gilpin, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); Jonathan Edwards, "The End for Which God Created the World" in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 1 (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1995), 94–121; Charles R. Watson, *God's Plan for World Redemption: An Outline Study of the Bible and Missions* (Philadelphia, PA: United Presbyterian Church of N. A., 1911); Grant Underwood, *The Millenarian World of Early Mormonism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993); James H. Moorehead, *American Apocalypse: Yankee Protestants and the Civil War, 1860–1869* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978); Stuart Murray and James McCabe, *Norman Rockwell's Four Freedoms: Images That Inspire a Nation* (Stockbridge, MA: Norman Rockwell Museum, 1993); Tom Wolfe, *The Right Stuff* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1979); Stephen R. Covey, A. Roger Merrill, and Rebecca R. Merrill, *First Things First Every Day: Because Where You're Headed Is More Important Than How Fast You're Going* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

John F. Kennedy, and Ronald Reagan, the purposes of liberal internationalism have permeated the national culture. America the successful and victorious redeemer has understood itself as an exceptional nation: chosen by Providence to redeem itself through its globalism.³²

Whether the Americans in question were deeply religious or thoroughly secular, they could not then—and today cannot—escape the cultural phenomenon of personal redemption. That redemption may have been banal or quixotic, or vane and elitist, but in all cases it has been defined by the individual. To be an American, one inherits the historical claims of American nationality, including a commitment to self-definition. Irrespective of the impact of secular culture on modern American life, the idea of seeking God's salvation through just purpose was and remains a core precept of national and individual purpose and identity. America, the redeemer—memorialized in literature and art, from the patriotic hymns, novels, music, and oil paintings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the cinematic mythology of the twentieth, invigorated by its worldly mission and success in modern history—has given the world an enormously complex scientific-industrial civilization.³³

By any historical standards, the country's achievements have been extraordinary. The breadth and depth of its globalism surpasses that of all previous empires in world history. Indeed, the United States, with its combined political, military, and economic power, cultural influence, and stunning scientific and technological innovations has attained the unique distinction of a truly international civilization. In the technocratic age of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, Americanism pervades the consciousness of national cultures. Not only Coca-Cola or McDonald's, or the icons of rock music and Hollywood, but also the genuine, impetuous nature of Americanism has caused it to dominate.³⁴ Clearly, the world scientific and industrial revolutions that the United States has come to demonstrate its status as the ship of state for Western society.

According to the "grand narrative" of American history, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Americans, through their legendary traits of innovation and entrepreneurialism, through collaborative and voluntary associations, and through a willingness to tolerate all kinds of rebellion and unconventional thinking enabled their

³²Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Redeemer Nation: The Idea of America's Millennial Role* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1968); Michael Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987); Ninkovich, *The Wilsonian Century*; Thomas Knock, *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Orrin Schwab, *Defending the Free World: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson and the Vietnam War, 1961–1965* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998).

³³Tuveson, *Redeemer Nation*; Margarita Mathiopoulos, *History and Progress: In Search of the European and American Mind* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1989), 93–150.

³⁴Emily Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890–1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982); Michael J. Hogan, ed., *The Ambiguous Legacy: U.S. Foreign Relations in the "American Century"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Eric Smoodin, ed., *Disney Discourse: Producing the Magic Kingdom* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

country to impress its leadership on the world. In the course of just one century, the country surpassed the imperial achievements of the great European empires. From generation to generation, the culture has supported its cherished belief in the singular or exceptionalist place of America in modern world history.³⁵

American exceptionalism, despite its banishment from historiography, remains a mythos that has dominated American nationalist identity. Its truisms have been repeated in school textbooks and political rhetoric, reinventing a perpetual iconography for American history. The country, a British society transplanted to a wilderness of seemingly boundless natural wealth, took as its mission, Judeo-Christian and Calvinist in nature, to bring Zion back to the world. Zion has been metaphorical for all the struggles or missions that Americans have undertaken since 1776. Since independence, Americans have fought for freedom and equality because these are required by natural law. These ideas were always contextual or historical notions. So, freedom for the South was a very different freedom than for those in the North, and still more different for groups such as African Americans who bore racial discrimination almost everywhere. The sanctity of the American Zion remained particular to different groups as the country moved into the twentieth century. On all sides of political and economic issues—from labor rights, women's rights, and foreign policy to government taxation and regulation—the concept of a new Zion inspired Americans.³⁶

In being inspired, they combined synergistically the Protestant Reformation with the scientific and capitalist revolutions of the Enlightenment. The energy for messianic quest, combined with the rational, antiauthoritarian, commercial orientations of the early

³⁵Ross, "Grand Narrative"; Tuveson, *Redeemer Nation*, 187–214. Some of the most outstanding examples of scripted American exceptionalism can be found in the rhetoric of contemporary American nationalists. See Norman Podhoretz, *Why We Were in Vietnam* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982); Barry M. Goldwater, *Why Not Victory? A Fresh Look at American Foreign Policy* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962). The other side of redemption may be seen in the equally sanctimonious rejection of American exceptionalism in the rhetoric of the American left. See Noam Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* (London: Verso, 1991); Ramsey Clark, *War Crimes: A Report on United States War Crimes against Iraq* (Washington, DC: Maisonneuve Press, 1992); Joan Hoff, "The American Century: From Sarajevo to Sarajevo," in Michael J. Hogan, ed., *The Ambiguous Legacy: U.S. Foreign Relations in the "American Century"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 183–231. The redemptive script is present in most political and social writings by Americans. The need to justify and sanctify one's own argument through moralizing has been a quintessential style of American scholars writing about contemporary issues.

³⁶David Bilger, *Forgotten Kingdom: The Mormon Theocracy in the American West, 1847–1896* (Spokane, WA: Arthur H. Clark, 1998); Jeffry Kaplan, *Radical Religion in America: Millenarian Movements from the Far Right to the Children of Noah* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997); James Holstun, *A Rational Millennium: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Ruth H. Bloch, *Visionary Republic: Millennial Themes in American Thought 1756–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); David Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (London: Vintage, 1986).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

republic, formed the script for the next two centuries.³⁷ Over two centuries, the synthesis of seventeenth-century radical British Protestantism with the liberal technocratic paradigm of Western industrialism produced the redeemer of the technocratic age. America's Zion, originally Puritan, then Jeffersonian, in the twentieth century eventually became the digital and militarized society of the late Cold War. By the early twenty-first century, the small hamlets of the seventeenth and eighteenth century that had been America had been replaced by a nation that had become the global embodiment of technocratic culture and institutions.³⁸

From a nationalist perspective, American history has been a truly exceptional enterprise of nation building. The political history of the United States describes a nation that was conceived only in the eighteenth century. It was a "new" society settled in a "new" world of enormous virgin forests, richly fertile plains, and freshwater lakes and rivers. American culture, founded on the issues and collective memories of the English Civil War, required a broad definition of human freedom and a limited state. As the historiography suggests, the unique circumstances of the nation's origins, and the scripted paths of its founding peoples toward political and religious tolerance and egalitarianism, led the country to the brilliant industrial and scientific developments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Irrespective of its political contradictions, which are legion, in its genesis the United States was and remains a nation of world historical importance. Its success in expanding its cultural, political, and strategic domains from North America to the far corners of the globe has been almost unbounded.³⁹

American historiography has portrayed an increasingly heterogeneous and complex nation. Heterogeneity was found not only in the country's demographics, which have, of course, been marked by the increasing non-Western European origins of the American

³⁷Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Knopf, 1992), 325–47; Charles Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815–1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

³⁸U.S. Government, *Office of the President, National Science and Technology Council, National Nanotechnology Initiative: The Initiative and Its Implementation Plan, NSTC/NSET Report, July 2000*; Mihail C. Roco and William Sims Bainbridge, eds., *Societal Implications of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology* (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001).

³⁹For current treatments see, for example, the essays in Hogan, *The Ambiguous Legacy and The Historiography of American Foreign Relations since 1941* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). A mistaken belief in America's "decline" was a response to the foreign policy disasters of the Cold War's middle period (notably the Vietnam War) and the industrial competitiveness of Japan and Western Europe. These factors triggered a small literature that addressed American decline as a global power. See Lester Thurow, *The Zero-Sum Society: Distribution and the Possibilities for Economic Change* (New York: Basic Books, 1980) and *Zero-Sum Solution: Building a World-Class American Economy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1985); Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (New York: Random House, 1987); Paul Kennedy, *Preparing for the Twenty-first Century* (London: HarperCollins, 1993). The economic and strategic changes of the first decade of the post-Cold War period militated against these arguments.

population, but also in the cosmopolitan nature of American urban culture. In its complexity, the historiography documents the institutional expansion and diversity of both public and private sectors and the growth of regulatory regimes, industrial systems, and technologies as the military institutions that defined the Cold War. The historical literature has been dominated by generations of nationalist historians sensitive to the nuances of American language and culture. These narratives have depicted an American society in the twentieth century that is both an integral national community as well as a dominant nation-state in international relations.⁴⁰

It is remarkable that given the exponential technological and demographic changes of the last two hundred years, strong similarities remain between the United States at its conception and the United States today. A nation of subsistence farmers, who knew nothing more than how to plow a field and work with animals, has become thoroughly technocratic—not merely industrialized, but postindustrial, with its vision of the future digital and molecular.⁴¹ Ostensibly, the agrarian nation of between three and four million people would appear hardly comparable with its muscular, technocratic descendant. The America of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century participates in a world dominated by enormous quantities of scientific and technical information and by intellectual constructs that represent an entirely different idea of the nature of the universe and human life. Its society is composed of several hundred million people, with few living off the land. Gentlemen of the early republic spoke French and Latin and might have been familiar with science as understood two hundred years ago.⁴² There was no theory of evolution as yet, nor a theory of relativity, electrical appliances, combustion engines, nuclear physics, electronic computers, or telecommunications; nor were there space satellites, x-ray machines, magnetic resonance imaging, electronic databases, radio or television, Internet, or any other form of mass communication except for occasion newspapers. There were no jet aircraft or, other than balloons, aircraft of any kind. Photography was unknown, as were refrigeration, sterilization, and microscopy. The material culture known to the founders included sailing ships, lanterns, muskets, and horse carriages. Despite the acceptance of the heliocentric universe and the scientific and mathematical methods of the Enlightenment, secular thought was only thinly separated from religious doctrine.⁴³

It would appear that the chronological distance between the eighteenth and twentieth—and now twenty-first—centuries does not capture the magnitude of change in material culture. The path of American history over two centuries demonstrates such radical change in technological development, and in consciousness, that one wonders if

⁴⁰Hogan, *America in the World*, 1–155.

⁴¹Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*; *Sellers*, *The Market Revolution*; *William Gates*, *Business @ the Speed of Thought: Succeeding in the Digital Economy* (New York: Warner Books, 2000).

⁴²Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 91, 195–203.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 189–212; *Bernard Cohen*, *Science and the Founding Fathers: Science in the Political Thought of Jefferson, Franklin, Adams and Madison* (New York: Norton, 1995).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

continuity in American culture has been superseded by it. Naturally, contemporary America represents a vastly different society. All the superlatives are more or less correct. Twenty-first century America has become immeasurably wealthier, more powerful, and technologically more advanced. In ethnocultural terms as well, the country has been transmogrified over the last century. Protestant Christianity must now share space with a much larger Catholic population, as well as American Jews, Orthodox Christians, Muslims, Hindus, and Buddhists, not to mention the new nineteenth-century Christianity of Mormonism, and the New Age religions of the twentieth century. In addition to the four British seed cultures that Andrew Hackett Fischer documents so brilliantly, Americans are also of more than a hundred new ethnicities, including such broad categories as Eastern and Southern European, Middle Eastern, South Asian, Southeast Asian, East and Central Asian, Pacific Islander, Latino and Latino Amerindian, African American, African, Afro-Caribbean, and Native American. In sum, the country is at least as different as the world itself has become over the last two centuries of modern times.⁴⁴

Whether or not Americans and American public historians agree, the United States has become culturally and institutionally a nation that has transcended its origins. Its bureaucratic modernity and mass culture and its pervasive multiethnic and multiracial internationalism have created a new state and civil society quite different from either the reality or the vision of the founding generation. The axiomatic distinction in American historiography between Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian Americas has been surpassed by the vision of the new century. The shape of the new American culture of the twenty-first century is both ethereal and overpowering. No doubt its development will epitomize the postmodernism and cosmopolitanism found at the center of America's most important cities, redefining a Western culture, now a global culture, that the aged cultural historian Jacques Barzun believed, contemplating New York City in 1995, had run its course. The new culture should also develop, following the script for the liberal technocratic order, as engineered reality produced by scientific and corporate institutions. One may surmise that the new century should quickly envelope America inside a new mentality. This new consciousness might thoroughly transcend the digital and technocratic into a post-technocratic civilization. Most likely, those terms that describe the present will become embedded in the language of the new age. They should become part of the substrate of a new and truly global civilization.⁴⁵

⁴⁴David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989). Widely reported figures circa 2000 showed 190 ethnic groups with nearly as many languages in the New York City borough of Queens (population 2.2 million). For an overview of census figures, see Population Reference Bureau, "America's Diversity and Growth: Signposts for the 21st Century," Population Bulletin 55, no. 2 (June 2000) (Washington, DC: GPO, 2000).

⁴⁵A thoroughly erudite and cynical view of this civilization is found in Jacques Barzun, *From Dawn to Decadence: 500 Years of Western Cultural Life, 1500 to the Present* (New York: HarperCollins, 2000), 773–802.

Chapter I

The Scripting of American Internationalism

Throughout its history, American society has been an amalgam of collective narratives. Each of these narratives has been a script connected in numerous ways to smaller and larger ones. An important question to ask is whether the scripts that define American society are still applicable in the current age. In other words, despite the vast changes in American society, does the scripting process hold through time? Does, in fact, the United States—as an institutional system, as a national culture, and as a nation-state—have the same script in the twenty-first century as it did in the eighteenth? Does continuity exist between the revolutionary and early republic America of Thomas Jefferson and the machine-driven technocracy of the Cold War? Does the same script remain at the core of American culture? The short answer to these questions should be yes.

In popular history and in much of the academic historiography of twentieth-century America, U.S. foreign relations have been portrayed as a practice involving a society whose relationship and mission to the world has always been explicit. In the academic literature, the mission of exporting American ideals is attached to a complex combination of ulterior motives involving economic, political, and strategic interests that also need to be differentiated between various domestic, institutional, and international elites.⁴⁶

Americans who shaped American international history from the First World War to the present belonged to different groups, each with its particular style and influence on the scope of foreign policy. There were statesmen of enormous historical importance who made a decisive impact on the world and American society. Looking at the twentieth century as a whole, leading figures such as Franklin Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Dean

⁴⁶Fischer would say yes. Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, 880–98. In *U.S. foreign relations, this begs the question between the various advocates of cultural, political, world systems, corporatist, and national security studies. Of course there is no consensus, other than on the complexity of the subject. See the roundtable discussion on the field in Hogan, America in the World*, 1–155.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Acheson, Dean Rusk, John Foster Dulles, Ronald Reagan, Jimmy Carter, and Bill Clinton came with disparate views of the international system and of the respective uses of American power to sustain it. In a very similar vein, the same matters of interests and mission were clear to influential American historians and social scientists. Seminal thinkers such as George Kennan, Walt Rostow, Arthur Schlesinger, and Harold Lasswell and journalists such as Walter Lippmann, Joseph Alsop, David Halberstam, and James Reston had an almost intuitive understanding of the dynamics of their culture. With very different concepts of American power and morality in world affairs, what all American observers dealt with and had to come to terms with in the American century was the collective national script for American history.⁴⁷

The script for the United States and for any large nation-state should be understood as the integration or synthesis of collective scripts, connected to each other through common national experience. Over several hundred years, the American script has always been a “metascript,” integrating vast networks of institutional, cultural, and group narratives into a common organizing gestalt. A large collective script, by necessity, organizes thousands of agents, each with its own particular historical narrative, grounded in the time and place of the individuals who have created it. Intricate, multilevel, dynamic, and adaptive, a metascript existed at the nation’s birth in the eighteenth century and evolved and adapted from one generation to the next as the national dynamics, based upon ethnicity and group interests, demonstrated both continuity and change for the nation-state. Continuity and change were both found in the dramas of redemption from slavery, in patriotic wars, and

⁴⁷The idea of a script that I use comes from the psychoanalytic tradition, specifically, the theories of Eric Berne, founder of the field of transactional psychology. Since his death in 1970, the closely related field of narrative psychology has blossomed. Narrative theory presupposes the same analytical construct: that human behavior is a product of a defined narrative. See Eric Berne, *The Structure and Dynamics of Organizations and Groups* (New York: Grove Press, 1963); Eric Berne, *Intuition and Ego States: The Origins of Transactional Analysis: A Series of Papers* (San Francisco: TA Press, 1977); Eric Berne, *Beyond Games and Scripts* (New York: Grove Press, 1976); Eric Berne, *What Do You Say after You Say Hello? The Psychology of Human Destiny* (New York: Grove Press, 1972); Claude Steiner, *Scripts People Live: Transactional Analysis of Life Scripts* (New York: Grove Press, 1974); James M. Glass, *Psychosis and Power: Threats to Democracy in the Self and the Group* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995); M. P. Freeman, *Rewriting the Self: History, Memory, Narrative* (New York: Routledge, 1993); R. Langs, “Psychoanalysis: Narrative Myth or Narrative Science,” *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 29, no. 4 (1993): 555–94; K. M. Hunter, *Doctors’ Stories: The Narrative Structure of Medical Knowledge* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991); M. F. Hanley, “‘Narrative,’ Now and Then: A Critical Realist Approach,” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 77, no. 3 (1996): 445–57; O. F. Goncalves, “Cognitive Narrative Psychotherapy: The Hermeneutic Construction of Alternative Meanings,” *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy* 8, no. 2 (1994): 105–25; P. Van den Broek and R. Thurlow, “The Role and Structure of Personal Narratives,” special issue, *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy* 5, no. 4 (1991): 257–74.

in the battles over economic and civil rights that became so essential to the twentieth century's American narrative.⁴⁸

All historical scripts have to do with repetition. The actions of all political actors are founded upon complex cultural systems that repeat scenes and behaviors over historical time. In American history and in contemporary society there exists a national script that we can trace over centuries. However, as noted, this national script does not exist alone. All national scripts exist within complex webs of subordinate scripts that connect groups, institutions, and individuals. The national narrative existed in historical time, overlapping with a plethora of personal, familial, and group narratives that compose history in its entirety. Despite this seemingly unfathomable complexity, the dynamic organization of scripts within a society establishes an order. That order maintains itself even when it contains conflict systems of deep pathology and destructiveness.

To historians and students of American history, the scripts that define the national experience should be quite familiar. In the well-defined American historiography and in popular culture, the idea of scripts driving large groups, small groups, and individuals seems intuitive. Historically, there were American scripts for the multigenerational conflict over slavery. Slavery ultimately raised the passions of debate to the point of secession and civil war. Undoubtedly, in such times, men begin to act reflexively, according to patterns of inherited behavior. The passions that drove the Civil War were scripted in the largest sense by the predicted actions of both sides against one another.⁴⁹

Indeed, scripts may be easily identified within the well-developed subfields of American historiography. There were distinctive scripts for western settlement, in which different groups of pioneers moved across the Appalachians, the Ohio River valley, the Mississippi, the Great Plains, and finally the western mountains and deserts to the Pacific region. The Turner thesis aside, group scripts related to religion, ethnicity, and family drove settlers west to encounter native Amerindians and Mexicans. As "cultural systems" (to borrow a term from anthropology), scripts ordered life on the frontier for both the settlers and the peoples they encountered.⁵⁰ Further, for each of the nation's wars, from Valley Forge to the Gulf War, and all manner of crises, foreign and domestic, within American political history, scripts have been both operational and observable. American

⁴⁸Taylor Branch, *Pillar of Fire: America in the King Years, 1963–1965* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998); Alan Dawley, *Struggles for Justice: Social Responsibility and the Liberal State* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991); Cass Sunstein, *After the Rights Revolution: Re-Conceiving the Regulatory State* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).

⁴⁹James McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); William Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776–1854* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983).

⁵⁰See, for example, William H. Goetzmann, *New Lands, New Men: America and the Second Great Age of Discovery* (New York: Viking, 1986); Richard White and Patricia Limerick Nelson, *The Frontier in American History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

social, political, cultural, and economic history can all be defined with respect to the activation, development, evolution, and resolution of multileveled scripts, connecting individual actors with groups, institutions, and the larger matrices of society and the nation-state. Scripts produced collective action, as with the anti-immigrant riots and labor strikes of the late nineteenth century. They also controlled the actions and life plans of individuals, from presidents to lesser historical figures. Clearly, William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech was a critical event in his personal life script, just as his performance as prosecutor in the Scopes trial of 1924 was another scripted landmark. (He died soon after.)⁵¹

In the vast realm of American historiography, whose past and present practitioners number in the tens of thousands, or more, there are innumerable scripts and metascripts. Scripts have defined the most pointed and elemental themes in American history. In the literature and in primary sources for the twentieth century, there were compelling scripts for the Great Depression, Pearl Harbor, the Bay of Pigs invasion, and the Cuban Missile Crisis. Certainly, Kennedy's assassination and its aftermath were deeply scripted as event and as memory for American and international culture. American intervention in Vietnam was a grand, tragic narrative sewed into the fabric of American history by Lyndon Johnson, ostensibly a president of immense power, but whose actions were clearly guided by the hidden voices of the American script. When Johnson gave his July 1965 press conference speech that committed the United States to large-scale intervention, Johnson was an agent of history far more than an agent for himself.⁵²

Scripts were present when Ronald Reagan visited with Mikhail Gorbachev in Iceland in 1986 for the famous summit that precipitated the end of the Cold War. Earlier, when Richard Nixon negotiated with Mao Zedong in 1972, beginning the path toward

⁵¹Robert Cherny, *A Righteous Cause: The Life of William Jennings Bryan* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994); Louis W. Koenig, *Bryan: A Political Biography of William Jennings Bryan* (New York: Putnam Press, 1971); Kendrick Clements, *William Jennings Bryan: Missionary Isolationist* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983); Lawrence W. Levine, *Defender of the Faith: William Jennings Bryan, The Last Decade, 1915–1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).

⁵²The progressive school offers a classic interpretation of the Great Depression and World War II that invokes the script. See Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., *The Age of Roosevelt*, 3 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957–1960) and James MacGregor Burns, *The Lion and the Fox* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956) and Roosevelt: *The Soldier of Freedom* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1970); more contemporary versions of this narrative are found in John P. Diggins, *The Proud Decades: America in War and Peace* (New York: Norton, 1988) and David M. Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1933–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); for Kennedy and Johnson, see the edited and annotated collections Philip Zelickow and Ernest May, eds., *The Kennedy Tapes: Inside the Kennedy White House during the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997) and Michael R. Beschloss, *Taking Charge: The Johnson White House Tapes, 1963–1964* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997) and *Reaching for Glory: Lyndon Johnson's Secret White House Tapes, 1964–1965* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001).

diplomatic normalization between the two adversarial powers, they too followed the mechanisms of scripts.⁵³ As in so many other encounters between political actors, each statesman fulfilled his role within the historical context of his national leadership. No matter how doggedly some social scientists and historians subscribe to the idea of individual agency and the indeterminacy of history, human scripts have enveloped and defined history. Many historians writing about the philosophy of history have emphasized the complexity and unpredictability of what they have studied. However, I submit that cognitive structures that contain human cultures, including memories of war, are transmitted one generation to the next. What may look unpredictable is in fact quite predictable with respect to the scripts that are being engaged at the time.

As a matter of intellectual supposition, I argue that scripts exist and are the principal agents for human behavior, at all levels of societal interaction and organization. They apply to individuals and groups as well as institutions. Scripts (or metascripts) guide nation-states through time. They are adaptive systems that modify in response to changes within the international system. Further, they adapt to changes within the internal structures of nations themselves. Ultimately, they can be understood as vast and formidably complex communication systems that shape culture and organize individual and collective action. By themselves, the human beings that compose them, including statesmen, artists, poets, intellectuals, scientists, and polemicists, may be able to fully understand only small parts of that complexity. It is that apparent depth and indeterminacy that has made national scripts simultaneously knowable and enigmatic, predictable but also paradoxical in nature.

A Comparative View of Collective Scripts

Beyond the nation-state, historical forces that commit states to structure and repetition also organize civilizations that transcend national boundaries. Classical Western civilization has survived for thousands of years, as have Chinese, Hindu, and Jewish

⁵³Michael Mandelbaum and Strobe Talbott, *Reagan and Gorbachev* (New York: Vintage Books, 1987); Don Oberdorfer, *From the Cold War to a New Era: The United States and the Soviet Union, 1983–1991* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Jerry F. Hough, *Democratization and Revolution in the USSR, 1985–1991* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1997); Gordon Hahn, *Russia's Revolution from Above, 1985–2000: Reform, Transition, and Revolution in the Fall of the Soviet Communist Regime* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002); Ross Terrill, *Mao: A Biography*, rev. ed. (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997); Xiaobing Li and Hongshan Li, eds., *China and the United States: A New Cold War History* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998); Kuo-kang Shao, *Zhou Enlai and the Foundations of Chinese Foreign Policy* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1996); John W. Garver, *China's Decision for Rapprochement with the United States* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1982); Richard Reeves, *President Nixon: Alone in the White House* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001); Henry Kissinger, *White House Years* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1979); Franz Schurmann, *The Foreign Politics of Richard Nixon: The Grand Design* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); Richard C. Thornton, *The Nixon-Kissinger Years: Reshaping America's Foreign Policy* (St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 2001).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

civilizations. The scripts for these civilizations have been transmitted across generations, centuries, and millennia through the institutions of oral tradition, written tradition, and the group and life scripts of living historical cultures. Contemporary world civilization is an amalgam of historical scripts stretching back to the beginnings of permanent human settlement. Through hundreds of generations, these psychosocial structures have continued to reproduce the elements of their ancient scripts. The Jews continue the biblical narrative of oppression and rescue; the Chinese continue their traditions of cultural and political ethnocentrism even as they accommodate the “barbarians.” In Western civilization, the impetus for scientific inquiry and rationality, as well as democratic political processes, preserves the methods and ideals of classical Greco-Roman civilization. The countervailing classical scripts for democracy and political order were preserved in Anglo-American and Latin American civilization. Hence, the modern empires and democracies of Europe and the Americas reproduced the Greek and Roman republics and the Roman Empire, gone for two thousand years.

As in theatrical narratives, historical scripts have a beginning, an end, and an underlying purpose. An examination of an individual’s life script will show these elements easily. A political leader is born into a given family, in a given time and place. His or her script becomes shaped by the confluence of experience, cultural milieu, and familial expectations that bear upon the individual. Franklin Roosevelt’s leadership script was firmly ensconced in the context of his highly influential upper-class New York family and his particular role within the larger family. Adolf Hitler, in contrast, followed a life course, a career, that both fit and defined the tragedy that fell upon Germany in the twentieth century. His pathology was also the pathology of German culture as it wrestled with its national past and present. When these two giants, good and evil, of twentieth century history faced each other in the 1930s and 1940s, it was an encounter that mobilized both individual and collective scripts in New Deal America and Nazi Germany.

In collective scripts, the purpose may be less apparent, unless the entity can truly be viewed in its entirety across historical time.⁵⁴ At the individual level, the psychological architecture of images, memories, perceptions, and attitudes that shape an individual’s

⁵⁴This point raises the issues of group process and theories of collective action. *Collective action*, as defined by most economists, political scientists, and sociologists, concerns different versions of rational choice theory. See John Scott, “Rational Choice Theory,” private.www.essex.ac.uk/~scottj/socscot7.htm. “Rational choice” is of little interest to historians, anthropologists, or other observers who define collective action with respect to historical cultures. *Collective or group scripts are subconscious forms of “collective memories.” These may also be termed “narrative knowledge” or “co-intelligence.”* See Joyce Appleby Adams, ed., *Knowledge and Postmodernism in Historical Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 1996); Julie Cruikshank, *The Social Life of Stories: Narrative and Knowledge in the Yukon Territory* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); Bo Strath, ed., *Myth and Memory in the Construction of Community: Historical Patterns in Europe and Beyond* (New York: P.I.E.-P. Lang, 2000); Janet Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

life choices, social roles, and personal outcomes are a script.⁵⁵ Scripts that are fundamentally the same guide all individuals, from ordinary workers and professionals to local, national, and international personages. All individual scripts, or life narratives, are embedded in larger collective scripts. A collective narrative describes the history of groups, large and small. Families are scripted, as are groups, institutions, cultures, nation-states, and civilizations. Collective scripts develop over years, decades, centuries, and, in the case of civilizations, millennia. Judeo-Christian, Chinese, Hindu, and animist civilizations are cultural systems that survived and adapted as political, economic, technological, and demographic change surrounded them. Nation-states too, whether they are victors in or victims of the international system, have existed over centuries, carrying their collective narratives of tragedies and triumphs from one generation to the next.⁵⁶ Scripts appear to organize all areas of human existence, and there may be, if we think broadly enough, a script for the human species itself—an organizing system defined by evolution and the place of *Homo sapiens* in the biological world. In this sense, the concept of cognitive-behavioral scripts is consistent with the evolutionist's view of all life. That is, life systems are guided by what Edward Wilson has termed "epigenetic rules."⁵⁷ In human history, those rules are found embedded everywhere in the dramaturgy of human narratives. There are winners and losers, as there must be. Winning and losing is partly self-defined. However, in the often hard and brutal history of human competition and survival, there have been many times when loss—oppression and deprivation—has been forced upon peoples as something of an inheritance.

For the principal topics of this book, American and global history of the twentieth century, the scripts for the modern world have been many. They have been sweeping, overlapping, paradoxical, and antithetical. There have been both well-defined and amorphous narratives for recurring wars, for comparative national industrial and scientific development, for comparative forms of liberalism, authoritarianism, totalitarianism, capitalism, socialism, anarchy, nationalism, and imperialism, and for at least several distinct episodes of genocide. Modern history, dominated by ideologies, mass movements, demagogues, and icons, as well as the stolid institutions and technocratic knowledge systems of machine-driven societies, has still organized itself through scripted narratives. The First World War propelled military organizations as well as entire national cultures against one another. Fierce nationalist passions and enormous

⁵⁵Steiner, *Scripts People Live*; Berne, *What Do You Say after You Say Hello?*; Alfred Adler, *The Pattern of Life*, rev. ed. (1930; reprint, Chicago: Alfred Adler Institute of Chicago, 1982); Harry Stack Sullivan, *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry* (New York: Norton, 1953).

⁵⁶Vera Schwarcz, *Bridge across Broken Time: Chinese and Jewish Cultural Memory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); Diane Barthel, *Historic Preservation: Collective Memory and Historical Identity* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996); Charlotte Tacke, ed., *1848: Memory and Oblivion in Europe* (New York: P.I.E.-P. Lang, 2000); Arthur G. Neal, *National Trauma and Collective Memory: Major Events in the American Century* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1998); Klaus Neumann, *Shifting Memories: The Nazi Past in the New Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000).

⁵⁷Wilson, *Consilience*, 163.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

reserves of military assets coalesced in a mixture of anarchy and preplanned military movements. Political scientists and historians have delved deeply into every aspect of the conflict, but in the last analysis, the clash of armies and national ideologies was scripted by the dynamics of European history. The Great War, like its successor and earlier conflicts, was a narrative constructed by the national scripts of the European state system.⁵⁸

Scripts at all levels were the constructive components of twentieth-century international history, building order in apparent chaos. Clearly, as we shall explore in this monograph, Hitler had a script, and so did Woodrow Wilson, Lenin, Stalin, Churchill, Roosevelt, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Zedong, Tojo, Hirohito, and all manner of international leaders who shaped the world's modern political map. There were scripts and a metascript that led to the First and Second World Wars and the Cold War. The scripts of nations, their leaders, and the regional and international systems governed the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Berlin Crises, Grenada, and the Gulf War, to name a broad swath of important crises and wars. The American army took its script to Vietnam, and then, greatly restructured, the script went to the Persian Gulf nearly a quarter of a century later. In the last analysis, irrespective of its material culture, the twentieth century was no different than any other period in world history. The script, a narrative structure connected to the needs and conflicts of historical actors, remained the paramount device for human societies to organize individual and collective actions. The interrelations between scripts have been the stuff of professional historical scholarship and modern social science.⁵⁹

The American script combined science and capitalism into an institutional and epistemological system connected to the nexus of ideas, customs, and laws of liberal constitutional rule. The redeemer nation would, with some significant exceptions, always see itself in this light, even if its actions belied its self-definition. The national script followed its soldiers into war, providing unity and determination in one conflict after another, from the American Revolution to the beginning of the Vietnam War. Scripted ideas of national interest and moral rectitude followed the United States through its suppression of the Philippines in the early 1900s and the occupation of Central American republics, not only during the first decades of the century but also in the 1980s during the Reagan administration. Further, even the dissident responses to the government's script,

⁵⁸For nationalist passions that triggered the war, see Barbara Tuchman, *The Guns of August* (New York: MacMillan, 1962); Jeffrey Verhey, *The Spirit of 1914: Militarism, Myth and Mobilization in Germany* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Mark Hewitson, *National Identity and Political Thought in Germany: Wilhelmine Depictions of the French Third Republic, 1890–1914* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Eugen J. Weber, *Nationalist Revival in France, 1905–1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959); Hubertus Jahn, *Patriotic Culture in Russia during World War I* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995).

⁵⁹The "script" is alternatively called "narrative" or "grand narrative" in historical literature. The social administrative and policy scientists refer to aspects of it as decision-making, group process, institutional memory, rational choice, game theory, role-playing, strategic planning, or other terms I understand as part of "technocratic" knowledge.

namely, the antiwar movements in American history, were equally scripted in their collective perceptions and responses. We can see this clearly in the anti-imperialist movements of the early twentieth century as well as in the peace movements of the Cold War.⁶⁰

The same antiscrypt or “counterscript” was apparent in the rejection of American oil interests in the 1970s and during the Gulf War in 1990 by what constituted the American “left.” The left counterscript included the American “green” movement of the last decades of the twentieth century, and the human rights activists who challenged the militarist policies of the officer corps and the conservative right. The American left, represented by a relatively small group of intellectuals and activists, was far weaker than its international counterparts but was committed to the defeat of the liberal technocratic metascript. The New Left acted with apparent conviction and passion, but, as with the nation-state, its activities were scripted collective actions. Whether we agree with the dissidents or not, the scripting was present, from the first to the last moments of protest and indignation.⁶¹

In this narrative, a metanarrative for the United States and the international community in the twentieth century, the script for the West is the liberal technocratic order. In that order, the United States shaped the narrative for scientific-industrial civilization within the cultural context of a settler society in the new world. It was a self-defined liberal society dominated originally by economic and political refugees from the British Isles. It was a nation formed by peripheral Celtic peoples (such as the Irish and Scotch-Irish), religious heretics, Puritans, Quakers, Catholics, and the losers of the English revolution, the Cavaliers of southern England. After centuries of nation building, the country reached its critical developmental role in the twentieth century. The liberal technocratic order, projected by the mission of the United States, the “redeemer nation,” foisted Wilsonian ideas and institutions upon the world from the First World War on toward the end of the century. Under the liberal order, a machine-dominated and quantifiable political economy

⁶⁰Robert L. Beisner, *Twelve against Empire: The Anti-imperialists, 1898–1900* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968); Penny M. Von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anti-Colonialism, 1937–1957* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997); Charles Chatfield, ed., *Peace Movements in America* (New York: Chicken Books, 1973); Charles DeBenedetti and Charles Chatfield, *An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1990); Robert Drinan, *Beyond the Nuclear Freeze* (New York: Seabury Press, 1983); Robert Jay Lifton and Richard Falk, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case against Nuclearism* (New York: Basic Books, 1982); Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, eds., *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993).

⁶¹Christopher Lasch, *The Agony of the American Left* (New York: Vintage Books, 1969); Marty Jezer, *Abbie Hoffman: American Rebel* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 93–171; Wini Breines, *Community and Organization in the New Left, 1962–1968: The Great Refusal* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1989); Roger Kimball, *The Long March: How the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s Changed America* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2000).

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

and culture engaged the international system in the protection of Western parliamentary rule as well as the capitalist structures of a market-oriented global economy.⁶²

Scripts: Dramaturgy and Human History

Viewing history as theater was a theoretical framework that developed during the Cold War. The structure of this approach came out of diverse streams of postmodern social theory borrowed from the structure functionalism and behaviorism of early postwar American social science. Cultural anthropologists understood the theory implicitly, having recognized the principles of symbolic action in understanding human societies. Earlier in the century, the development of psychoanalysis by Sigmund Freud established the framework in Western thought that rationality and irrationality were connected by the substrate of the unconscious mind. Like cultural anthropologists and psychodynamic psychologists, Freudian and neo-Freudian schools, including those who diverged into separate psychoanalytic theories, have all placed central importance on the semiotics of symbolism. Almost without exception they have understood human action as symbolic, ritualistic, and theatrical. The idea of scripts and human behavior is most particularly neo-Freudian or post-Freudian.⁶³

The dissident psychoanalyst Eric Berne, founder of the school of transactional psychology, was the leading exponent of the psychological script as the basis for therapy and diagnosis. In Berne's view, the life script thoroughly dominates all human interactions. Men and women are nothing but executors of the personal destiny that has been scripted for them by their parents and, in the larger view, by their grandparents and great-grandparents. From the perspective of Bernian script theory, the world is an infinite

⁶²Arno J. Mayer, *Politics and Diplomacy of Peacemaking: Containment and Counterrevolution at Versailles, 1918–1919* (New York: Knopf, 1967); Lloyd E. Ambrosius, *Woodrow Wilson and the American Diplomatic Tradition: The Treaty Fight in Perspective* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Knock, *To End All Wars*; Ninkovich, *The Wilsonian Century*; N. Gordon Levin, *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968).

⁶³Alfred Adler, "Individual Psychological Treatment of Neuroses" (1913), in *Theory of Individual Psychology* (Boston: Littlefield, Adams, 1973), 32–50; Loren Gray, *Alfred Adler: The Forgotten Prophet: A Vision for the 21st Century* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), 8–27, 83–103; Sullivan, *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*, 158–71, 367–84; Berne, *What Do You Say after You Say Hello?* 110–34, 244–98. *The idea of a life plan or script was found in the thought of Alfred Adler and Harry Stack Sullivan. Further, Carl Jung's concept of archetypes parallels the idea of scripts guiding different levels of human interaction. Jung's complex theory of human behavior, however, lends itself to cosmology and a biological determinism. Nonetheless, his ideas have been especially influential in the humanities. See Karin Barnaby and Pellegrino D'Acerno, eds., C. G. Jung and the Humanities: Toward a Hermeneutics of Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990) and Richard M. Gray, *Archetypal Explorations: An Integrative Approach to Human Behavior* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 185–249. However, Eric Berne, originator of the methods and theories of transactional analysis, fully developed the concept of a life script and an operative system of "ego states" which maintain it.

stage for the dramatization of life scripts. Individuals, despite their claims of agency, remain actors compelled by powerful unconscious motivations to speak their lines in personal and group dramas. They have almost always followed the scripts assigned to them, ensuring that their lives would meet the real expectations of their parents.⁶⁴

The psychoanalytic or transactional view of scripts has remained largely focused on the level of the individual. In anthropology, scripted actions have been understood within the context of cultures or cultural systems. From this perspective, cultures in their totality are the independent actors. Social roles, which all individuals have been assigned, are defined by semiotic systems. These systems of meaning, in turn, relate to the economic and political structures of society. So, in Clifford Geertz's nineteenth-century Balinese theater state Negara, the rules of social intercourse and engagement were established by the scripted dramaturgy of the state.⁶⁵ When Westerners invaded the traditional Balinese state, it ceremoniously committed suicide. The structure of Balinese society collapsed with the destruction of the elaborate rituals that were only possible within a self-contained cultural system. The important notion to me, as a modern international historian, is the depth of social control exercised by the belief systems that were found in that premodern society. It would appear to be supreme arrogance on the part of secular modern societies to believe that they established a less constructed or freer culture than that found in pre-Western Bali. What was true for non-Western preindustrial society in Indonesia should also be valid for Western cultures before and after the Enlightenment. Therefore, the concept of human agency becomes deeply problematic. Free will, a concept peculiar to the European Enlightenment, appears in all likelihood to be an illusion. Self-efficacy, individual autonomy, and similar notions are products of contemporary Western and specifically American culture, and in all likelihood they do not exist. Individuals cannot be autonomous agents of social change. What may appear as volitional, is, when understood historically, not volition but the working out of narrative linked to the collective scripts of a society.⁶⁶

The universality of life scripts suggests that they have been responsible for framing the psychological dimensions of reality for individuals in every part of society, without exception, even at the highest levels of human organization. In effect, the same principles of scripted behavior should apply whether the individuals in question are janitors or national security advisers to the president. In twentieth-century American history, transcripts and other documentation relating to the Cuban Missile Crisis and American intervention in Vietnam show the scripted basis for the institutional culture of national security.⁶⁷ In both cases from the 1960s, falling only three years apart, careful historians

⁶⁴Berne, *Beyond Games and Scripts*, 166–69; Steiner, *Scripts People Live*, 55.

⁶⁵Geertz, *Negara: The Theatre State in 19th Century Bali* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), 121–36, and “Ideology as a Cultural System,” in *Interpretation of Cultures*, 193–233.

⁶⁶Geertz, *Negara*, 12–13.

⁶⁷Mary S. McAuliffe, ed., *CIA Documents on the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962* (Washington, DC: History Staff, Central Intelligence Agency, 1992); Laurence Chang and Peter Kornbluh, eds., *The Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962: A National Security Archive Documents Reader* (New York: New

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

can see the methodical and predictable responses of the actors. In the recorded meetings, the high drama of Cold War foreign crisis enveloped the dialogues. When reading the verbatim transcripts relating to the October 1962 crisis, and those from the July 1965 conference on Vietnam, it becomes clear that the decision-making process in both cases was a framework built around an emotional and cognitive universe that virtually smelled of predetermination. The missile confrontation presented a nuclear stalemate, a balance of terror that had to be resolved through the correct face-saving compromises made by the American president and the Soviet leader. Likewise, in summer 1965 discussions to approve the expanded ground war in Vietnam, a similar stalemate occurred. It resulted in a hard compromise between the separate policy ideologies governing U.S. response. The dilemma over Vietnam not only mirrored the stalemate over Cuba three years earlier, but also the political and strategic locking of horns at the international level. The script that was working in the domestic sphere was also working to bring all of the national actors—North and South Vietnam, China and the Soviet Union, and the United States—into a collective narrative, albeit a tragic one, for the Vietnam War.⁶⁸

In the drama particular to American presidential decision-making, scripts have always been found neatly circumscribing the actions of individuals caught in the historical moment. Was Harry Truman acting out of free will when he ordered the dropping of the atomic bombs on Japan in 1945? Or when he ordered American soldiers into South Korea in 1950? Clearly, historians point to causes beyond the level of the executive function in government. Truman's actions were circumscribed by the political and cultural context of his time and place. The containment system that began with his presidency was the product of more than Harry Truman. Truman did not write the national security documents that planned the implementation of containment doctrine to circle the globe. He did not, for example, write NSC 68, which defined the structure of containment just before the start of the Korean War. Yet, the question remains for some whether individuals may still exercise insight and decisions that overcome the rigidities of bureaucratic determinism.⁶⁹

Were other political leaders of the last century acting freely, or were they scripted by their roles within the larger cultural universe prescribed by their time and place? Did Hitler build National Socialism in Germany out of his personal agency for an aggressive antiliberal, anticommunist nationalist movement, or were his particular vision and evil designs quintessentially an outcome predicted by German and European history? The argument here is that scripts communicate with each other through personal and

Press, 1998); Anatoli I. Gribkov and William Y. Smith, *Operation ANADYR: U.S. and Soviet Generals Recount the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Chicago: Edition q, 1994); *Zelikow and May*, *The Kennedy Tapes*; *Schwab*, *Defending the Free World*, 192–210; *Beschloss*, *Reaching for Glory*; *The Pentagon Papers: The Defense Department History of United States Decision-Making on Vietnam*, 5 vols., *Senator Gravel ed.* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971).

⁶⁸*Zelikow and May*, *The Kennedy Tapes*; *Schwab*, *Defending the Free World*, 154–69.

⁶⁹*Leffler*, *Preponderance of Power*, 313–14; *Cummings*, *The Roaring of the Cataract*, 177–82; *Hogan*, *A Cross of Iron*, 265–314.

collective mediums of exchange. An individual's life script is subliminally connected with the scripts of others. To a large degree, individuals must respond to the scripts of others within primary social groups such as family units and peer groups. Group scripts in turn connect in many ways to the collective scripts found at higher levels of political and social organization. Individuals, therefore, respond to scripted environments through multiple levels of interaction or synchronization. Adolf Hitler followed a script that placed him at the head of a movement that projected his vision of National Socialism to a German nation trapped in its own self-realizing national script. Hitler's life script shaped and responded to different levels of the state and society that he was instrumental in creating. The Nazi script placed him on a path to personal and national catastrophe. Yet, he followed it to the letter. In turn, the German nation coalesced around the narrative for National Socialism, which fulfilled certain essential needs but was ultimately, according to the pathological designs of Nazism, a path to the destruction of German society.⁷⁰

In all societies there are levels of scripts, organized by the cohesive and codetermining qualities that apply to most human behavior. In the last analysis, historical narrative structures control most of what happens, not only to individuals but to families, institutions, societies, and civilizations. In all societies, there are synchronous means of communication that unite the workings of different levels of social and political development. This was evident not only in the rigid authoritarian formalism of Nazi Germany, but even in the anarchic social environments of liberal societies, such as existed in the United States during the twentieth century, among other places. Scripted patterns of interaction govern the social systems of common folk who know nothing of great power politics, and of the elites who inhabit high government positions and university posts. Franklin Roosevelt's approach to the international system was shaped by a bevy of advisers and political allies; yet, the essential orientation and methods of his foreign policy, like those of his predecessors and successors, mirrored the strategic and ideological designs of American internationalism, provided by the national script. Roosevelt gave the famous "Four Freedoms" speech; he also founded the United Nations and established American power in the wake of the Axis threat. Yet, these tasks were all but predestined. The institutions and group interests that defined American internationalism defined Franklin Roosevelt as well. The script for his foreign policy was embedded within the dynamic structure of the American script. In turn, that script was an agent for the larger metascript of the West.⁷¹

Levels of scripted meaning and behavior are deeply embedded within the cultural semiotics of even the most scientific and rational of national groups. Whether we are

⁷⁰Kershaw, *Hubris and Nemesis*; William L. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany* (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1960); Bevin Alexander, *How Hitler Could Have Won World War II: The Fatal Errors That Led to Nazi Defeat* (New York: Crown, 2000).

⁷¹Warren Kimball, *The Juggler: Franklin Roosevelt as Wartime Statesman* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991); Robert Dallek, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy, 1932–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); Townsend Hoopes and Douglas Brinkley, *FDR and the Creation of the U.N.* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

speaking of Western or non-Western, secular, theocratic, capitalist, or socialist political systems, the mechanisms for sustaining order and providing agency are found within national scripts and the metascripts for civilizations. All the emotional and cognitive elements for national reproduction, survival, and expansion are found within the sophisticated psyches of national statesmen. The political actors may conduct subvocalized and often subliminal dialogues with the rooted concepts of their dramaturgy. Anthropologists have observed the coordination of scripted behaviors in non-Western preindustrial cultures and modern Western cultures alike. Almost like a dance, rituals mark the way individuals communicate. The same logical patterns of scripted drama are developed at the highest levels of institutional leadership within national cultures.⁷² Whether the actor was John F. Kennedy lecturing to the public on lofty ideals, or the holder of the movie camera in Dealy Plaza, when the bullets shot through the air, triumphal narrative as well as tragedy illuminated the lives of people. In both cases, from the perspective of the hero or the spectators, the theater of the assassination resonated with the national script. Kennedy's martyrdom fit the 1960s like a velvet glove. The political assassination of a beloved American president not only matched the poignant bittersweet age; in a broad sense, it created it.⁷³

Epistemologies: Knowledge Systems

Along with scripts for human action must come a parallel cognitive architecture for the acquisition and organization of social knowledge. More precisely, cognitive systems support the scripted basis for all human behaviors. These systems, whether they are spoken languages or fields of advanced Western science, organize experience and attach meaning to an environment. A way of cognition, or "knowing," includes what historians and social scientists have termed variously as "ideologies," "belief systems," "modes of understanding," and "epistemologies." Each of these concepts has separate connotations to individuals. A common precept of social science is that cognitive differences have been definitive of all cultures, present and historical. Human knowledge, acquired through the context of culture and the human senses, has always been grounded in a particular milieu. Therefore, according to these suppositions, knowledge must be socially constructed. An epistemology, or system of knowledge acquisition, should always be understood as a unique, historically grounded mental construction of the world. To give a

⁷²Fernando Poyatos, *Advances in Non-Verbal Communication: Sociocultural, Clinical, Esthetic, and Literary Perspectives* (Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 1992); Horst Ruthrof, (New York: Cassell, 2000); Murray Edelman, *Constructing the Political Spectacle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); David I. Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics and Power* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988); Stanley Jeyaraja Tambiah, *Culture, Thought, and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985); John Gledhill, *Power and Its Disguises: Anthropological Perspectives on Politics* (London: Pluto Press, 2000), 127–83.

⁷³Peter Dale Scott, *Deep Politics and the Death of JFK* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

prominent example, 1950s American Cold War social science was based upon and organized by the social construction of reality in Cold War America. When the Cold War changed in the 1960s, the epistemological systems that organize experience changed in ways particular to the historical context of the cultural system.⁷⁴

Technocratic knowledge concerns the cognition related to modern industrialism. It is particular to industrialized societies that have developed very complex ways of interpreting experience and controlling the vast industrial and communication networks that have emerged with industrial systems. Epistemology, a theory of knowledge, is an analytical term we may use historically to structure the variegated and dense ways in which modern societies organize knowledge. In my preferred usage, epistemologies are systems of knowledge, which means that they are active components of the construction of knowledge by individuals, groups, and societies. Technocratic epistemologies reference the quantitative knowledge systems of scientific and technical discourse. These systems expanded in the Western societies of the late modern period. Modern statistics, computer languages, analytical philosophy, accounting, and finance, as well as all the mathematically based physical, natural, and social sciences, are part of the Western technocratic epistemology.⁷⁵

Epistemological systems, or fields of technically based knowledge, are the modern languages of professional elites. In the last century, physicians have become increasingly technocratic in their training and methods; so too have all professional business managers trained in the quantitative disciplines of business administration. Scientists, engineers, managers, and in effect the entire corps of knowledge-based labor became, during the last century, practitioners of the technocratic. The technocratic defined knowledge as a form of technology, namely, a resource for the management of society. That knowledge, in turn, defined institutions and the entirety of modern cultures. Technocratic epistemology shaped the "Machine Age," including the planning and production for the New Deal in the United States, socialism in the Soviet Union under Stalin, fascism in the fascist states,

⁷⁴See Cumings, *Parallax Visions*, 173–204; Michael Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Christopher Simpson, ed., *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences during the Cold War* (New York: Free Press, 1998).

⁷⁵Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Dorothy Ross, ed., *Modernist Impulses in the Human Sciences, 1870–1930* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994); Theodore M. Porter, *The Rise of Statistical Thinking, 1820–1900* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986); David Salsburg, *The Lady Tasting Tea: How Statistics Revolutionized Science in the Twentieth Century* (New York: W. H. Freeman, 2001); Alain Desrosieres, *The Politics of Large Numbers: A History of Statistical Reasoning* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Steinar Strom, ed., *Econometrics and Economic Theory in the 20th Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998). Some early examples of the digital economy can be found in the 1960s quantitative literature; see George J. Brabb, *Introduction to Quantitative Management* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968); Thomas H. Naylor, *Computer Simulation Techniques* (New York: Wiley, 1966).

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

and, during the Second World War, institutional and epistemological systems for global war.⁷⁶

So too, in increasing ways, the technocratic script for the liberal order and the Stalinist order organized the dimensions of the technocratic Cold War. The rivalry was not only ideological and material, but in the largest sense it was technocratic. Technocratic epistemologies built the Cold War, producing professional knowledge and institutions that drove the military, economic, and political events of the period. The imperative to orient science and technology toward the overriding objectives of Cold War management was consistent with the institutional and national scripts that defined the confrontation between the East and the West. The technocratic script enabled the building of the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers. It drove the development of the space programs and the revolution in information technology that ensued from the Cold War drive for global control and mastery. In sum, the technocratic epistemologies for social and administrative science controlled the major public and private institutional systems of the twentieth century.⁷⁷

⁷⁶V. G. Afanasyev, *The Scientific Management of Society* (Moscow, Progress, 1971); R. I. Kosolapov, *Developed Socialism: Theory and Practice* (Moscow: Progress, 1983); Nodari A. Simonia, *Socialism in Russia: Theory and Practice* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994); Tom Bottomore, *The Socialist Economy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990); John Bennett, *The Economic Theory of Central Planning* (New York: Blackwell, 1989); Avraham Barkai, *Nazi Economics: Ideology, Theory, and Policy* (New York: Berg, 1990); Kenyon E. Poole, *German Financial Policies, 1932–1939* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939); Otto Nathan, *The Nazi Economic System* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1944); R. J. Overy, *(New York: Oxford University Press, 1994)*; Theodore Rosenof, *Economics in the Long Run: New Deal Theorists and Their Legacies, 1933–1993* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Charles S. Tippetts and Shaw Livermore, *Business Organization and Public Control* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1941); Robert Solo, *The Political Authority and the Market System* (Cincinnati, South-Western, 1974); David M. Hart, *Forged Consensus: Science, Technology, and Economic Policy in the United States, 1921–1953* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998); Timothy Moy, *War Machines: Transforming Technologies in the U.S. Military, 1920–1940* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001).

⁷⁷Christopher Simpson: “Universities, Empire and the Production of Knowledge: An Introduction” in *Universities and Empire*, xi-xxx; Emerson W. Pugh, *Building IBM: Shaping an Industry and Its Technology* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995); Kent C. Redmond and Thomas M. Smith, *From Whirlwind to MITRE: The R&D Story of the SAGE Air Defense Computer* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000); George B. Dyson, *Darwin among the Machines: The Evolution of Global Intelligence* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1997); *Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress, Ballistic Missile Defense Technologies* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1985); *Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress, Contributions of DOE Weapons Labs and NIST to Semiconductor Technology* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1993); John M. Collins, *Military Space Forces: The Next 50 Years* (Washington, DC: Pergamon-Brassey’s, 1989); Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science*.

Capitalism

Modern science and engineering are two sides of the modernization pyramid. The third is the class of epistemologies related to the concept of the market. Like electric power generation or medicine or any form of intellectual technology, capitalist theory is a complex knowledge system. One might argue, as many economic and international historians have, that the discovery of market theory during the Enlightenment was the most critical development for late modern history. The entire Western framework for the scientific and industrial revolutions of the nineteenth century was developed under capitalism. The theories and practices of capitalism effected the industrialization and the geographic expansion of European civilization.⁷⁸

As technocratic epistemology, capitalism consists of a panoply of related doctrines and institutional arrangements that govern the methods and protocols for modern markets and market institutions. The “technic” for business created the international markets and the modern international corporate institutions that dominated the global economy from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to the present. The disciplines of accounting and finance organized the control systems for institutions that have operated under market regimes designed by legal and economic doctrines developed over decades. The market, first “discovered” by British economists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, became both an epistemology and an organizational system for control. The epistemologies for market institutions, that is, capitalism, generated information systems and practices oriented toward prices and costs, the quintessence of all market knowledge. In the twentieth century, with their distribution of power and status as well as goods and services, markets at all levels of society, domestic and international, began to shape the entire nature of human cultures. In effect, the market organized the nonsocialist world through the distribution of complex information about needs and the comparative value of resources.⁷⁹

Market culture, as discussed, began in the early modern period of European history. Markets developed coterminously with the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century. As the new commercial medium became dominant, it soon supplanted the feudal culture

⁷⁸Alan K. Smith, *Creating a World Economy: Merchant Capital, Colonialism, and World Trade, 1400–1825* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991); Joyce Appleby, *Economic Thought and Ideology in Seventeenth Century England* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World Economy, 1730–1840s* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1989); James Foreman-Peck, *A History of the World Economy: International Economic Relations since 1850* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1995).

⁷⁹Philip Armstrong, *Capitalism since 1945* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991); Makato Ito, *The Basic Theory of Capitalism: The Forms and Substance of the Capitalist Economy* (Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble Books, 1988); George Reisman, *Capitalism: A Treatise on Economics* (Ottawa, IL: Jameson Books, 1996); Martin J. Osborne and Ariel Rubinstein, *Bargaining and Markets* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1990). For an example of management science, see Peter C. Bell, *Management Science/Operations Research: A Strategic Perspective* (Cincinnati: South-Western College Publishing, 1999).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

of Western Europe. From this, it follows that the American Revolution was not only a political transformation; it was also a cultural change of historic proportions. That cultural transformation revolved around a formidable change or revolution in economic means, namely, a “market revolution.”⁸⁰ The American colonies wanted freedom not only from British political institutions but also from the mercantilist practices of the empire. The market revolution in America, as Charles Sellers has investigated in his work on the Jacksonian era, created a thoroughly capitalist society in America. An industrialized market society had become the dominant cultural form in the United States by the mid-nineteenth century. By the twentieth century, the market had not only superseded the communal culture of an earlier agrarian age, it had come to thoroughly dominate the concept of culture in American society. By the time of the First World War and the dawning of the technocratic age, commercialism had become omnipresent. It was embedded in every aspect of life and consciousness. The market, in the form of mass society, mass production, and consumption, governed America as an ethos as well as an institutional system.⁸¹

The progressive era solidified American capitalism as a global force connected to the state as well as to multinational interests. The liberal technocratic state was born out of these changes of the second industrial revolution. It was a new, truly international state dedicated to the formation of global markets and nation-states capable of sustaining commerce and world peace. The advanced capitalist state incorporated new control mechanisms for regulating market regimes. The public and private sectors became codependent parallel systems for national development. As the nature of technology changed with communication, transportation, and the quantitative methods of twentieth-century information processing, market epistemology served the advanced capitalist state as well as the private sector. This meant that the industrial mobilization for the Second World War was dominated by the “organized capitalism” and mass production technology of American heavy industry. It also meant that industrial planning was orchestrated at the national level by the economic knowledge of government economists, who financed the war with income taxes and public debt.⁸² Further, during the Cold War, market epistemologies governed the development of large multinational corporations,

⁸⁰Sellers, *The Market Revolution*.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 301–95. Also see Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 325–47.

⁸²David A. Hounshell, *From the American System to Mass Production, 1800–1932: The Development of Manufacturing Technology in the United States* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press); Mark Rupert, *Producing Hegemony: The Politics of Mass Production and American Global Power* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Chris Freeman and Luc Soete, *The Economics of Industrial Innovation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997); Sten Thore, *The Diversity, Complexity, and Evolution of High Tech Capitalism* (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995); F. M. Scherer, *New Perspectives on Economic Growth and Technological Innovation* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999).

which, according to a now vast literature on corporate internationalism, were essential actors in the shaping of the containment system.⁸³

From the First World War up to the contemporary period, capitalism, as a body of effective knowledge, has shown its efficacy as a planning system in many different and quite self-evident ways. The industrial sectors that transformed the twentieth century—energy, materials, transportation, services, and agriculture—have demonstrated steady to remarkable gains in productivity related to market forces. In almost every case, industrial leaderships were united in their advocacy for international markets. The provisioning of supply and demand on an international scale allowed for the integration of global economic resources. However, variations in the effectiveness of the use of such resources meant internationalization had mixed outcomes. In many countries and industries, globalization resulted in unexpected social and economic costs, borne usually by groups and individuals rather than the state. Nonetheless, both Keynesian and monetarist doctrines viewed markets as organizing economies according to basic principles that govern all economic behavior.⁸⁴

By the end of the Cold War, market ideology had overcome the socialist models of economic development. Socialism's crisis grew with the transition from heavy industry to service-based and so-called high-technology economic systems. The economic costs of discarding the market as a distribution method in favor of central planning became far too enormous to ignore. With the assistance of ideological appeals from Ronald Reagan, among others, the market was found to be paramount to the functioning of the economy and society. Throughout the world, socialist practices went into decline or became extinct. Clearly, the end of the Cold War did not spell the end of all forms of socialism, or even communism. However, the death of Marxism-Leninism at the very end of the Cold War gave a free hand to liberal capitalism. Throughout the world beyond North America and Western Europe, the epistemology of the market became an organizing knowledge system and ideology for development and growth. The liberal order used and produced knowledge around the concept of the market for the exercise of global order as well as development and growth.⁸⁵

⁸³Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 135–88; Thomas J. McCormick, *America's Half-Century: United States Foreign Policy in the Cold War and After* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 72–83, 125–44; Michael Schaller, *The American Occupation of Japan: The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Cumings, *Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes*, 35–78, and *Parallax Visions*, 86–94, 205–26.

⁸⁴G. R. Steele, *Keynes and Hayek: The Money Economy* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Connell Fanning and David O Mahony, *The General Theory of Profit Equilibrium: Keynes and the Entrepreneur Economy* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); Edward J. Nell, *The General Theory of Transformational Growth: Keynes after Sraffa* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Mary S. Morgan and Malcolm Rutherford, eds., *From Interwar Pluralism to Postwar Neoclassicism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998); Carl Walsh, *Monetary Theory and Policy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998).

⁸⁵William K. Tabb, *Reconstructing Political Economy: The Great Divide in Economic Thought* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 177–202; Steven Saxonberg, *The Fall: A Comparative Study of the*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

During the most recent period of the postwar world, capitalism has continued to innovate through the technological revolutions of the early twenty-first century. Nonetheless, the crisis that fell upon the world with the events of September 11, 2001, suggested that the left's critique of capitalism, beginning with the socialists of the nineteenth century and continuing to the present, has a degree of validity. Clearly, the presence of both developed and grossly underdeveloped regions of the world, as well as class divisions within societies, points to the ongoing crisis of modernization or globalization in the post-Cold War epoch.⁸⁶ Despite unabashed ideological victory, the rationality of capitalist epistemology remained selective. As the socialist critique of capitalism has ably demonstrated, markets, by their very nature, have connected cosmopolitan ruling elites committed to their respective self-aggrandizements. A central political debate of the Cold War related to the whole concept of development. It is here that the "modernizationist" paradigm of mid-twentieth-century Keynesianism collided directly with the "underdevelopment" and imperialism models that were expounded by Marxists of every orientation.⁸⁷

The ideological debate over development ran from the early twentieth century till the end of the Cold War. Even with the victory of the market in the 1980s and 1990s, a generation of left-wing social scientists continued to dissent. The epistemology of modernization, and in its later reincarnation, globalization, centered the Western metascript on the non-Western world. The collective logic of modernization survived ideological debates over its imperial nature. Instead of dying or transforming itself, as many critics believed would happen in the wake of the failure of the early Cold War development policies, the modernization paradigm maintained itself. Its mission in the script was clear: expand the technocratic corporate internationalism centered in the West, promote the cosmopolitan culture of liberalism, including individualism and consumerism, and bring the world together under the huge and diverse umbrella of markets.⁸⁸

End of Communism in Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Poland (*Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 2001*), 67–126; Charles S. Maier, *Dissolution: The Crisis of Communism and the End of East Germany* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 59–107, 290–303; Herbert Giersch, *Privatization at the End of the Century* (New York: Springer, 1997); Ivan Volgyes, "The Economic Legacies of Communism" in Ivan Volgyes and Zoltan Barany, eds., *The Legacies of Communism in Eastern Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 42–54.

⁸⁶John Walton, *Free Markets and Food Riots: The Politics of Global Adjustment* (New York: Blackwell, 1994); Richard Harris and Melinda Seid, eds., *Critical Perspectives on Globalization and Neoliberalism in the Developing Countries* (Boston: Brill, 2000); K. S. Jomo and Shyamala Nagaraj, eds., *Globalization versus Development* (New York: Palgrave, 2001); Arjun Appadurai, ed., *Globalization* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001); Miriam Ching Yoon Louie, *Sweatshop Warriors: Immigrant Women Workers Take on the Global Factory* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2001).

⁸⁷Tabb, *Reconstructing Political Economy*, 177–202.

⁸⁸John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge, *A Future Perfect: The Challenge and Hidden Promise of Globalization* (New York: Times Books, 2000), 90–129; Kamran Mofid, *Market*

The epistemology of the post–World War II market system became part of the larger knowledge structure of the Cold War’s national security state. Washington’s Cold War doctrines used modernization theory as an essential aspect of global containment. To modernize meant to bring everything that was deemed “modern” to the “undeveloped” or, more euphemistically, “developing” countries outside of the West. In effect, modernization was Westernization or, in the terminology used here, “technocratization” of those nations, regions, and subregions that required integration into the containment structure. So, South Vietnam, beginning with the Eisenhower administration, was brought under the vigorous foreign aid regime of modernization and its alternative phraseology, “counterinsurgency.”⁸⁹ Western science, technology, and capitalism, agents of the Enlightenment and the American state, worked to build the Republic of Vietnam, as with other countries on the East Asian perimeter, into a Western-defined modern state. The epistemology of modernization shaped the economic, political, and military development of the South Vietnamese state. Of course, as we all know from history, the vast efforts of modernization and the machinations of American intervention did not, in the end, succeed in the ultimate objective of saving the state for the “free world.” (South Vietnam fell to the North Vietnamese army in 1975.)⁹⁰

Institutions: Organizational Systems

A principal argument in this narrative relates to a functional thesis, namely, that a set of interrelated concepts makes sense with respect to modern times. Such concepts are the technocratic state, technocratic knowledge, and the technocratic script. I derived my concept of a technocratic view of history from, first, the primary sources I found in researching technocratic American society in the 1960s. One of the most important secondary sources was the work of Lewis Mumford, the great historian of technology. Mumford interpreted history as technology centered, with the idea of the “technic” synonymous with the machine. The machine metaphor was quintessentially his view of modern institutions. Machines perform work as an extension of human labor. Harnessing energy and material structures, they increase human productivity. In the modern corporation, Mumford saw the machine as becoming a destructive force. The Western machine, dedicated to the exploitation of nature, worked mercilessly to achieve its ends.

Economy, Free Trade, Globalization and the Common Good (*London: Shephard-Walwyn, 2002*); Virginia Haufler, *A Public Role for the Private Sector: Industry Self-Regulation in a Global Economy* (Washington, DC: *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001*), 105–22. Buoyant views on the efficacy of international trade under current globalization are found in the collection by Pierre Sauvé and Robert Stern, eds., *GATS 2000: New Directions in Services Trade Liberalization* (Washington, DC: *Brookings Institution, 2000*).

⁸⁹D. Michael Schafer, *Deadly Paradigms: The Failure of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy* (Princeton, NJ: *Princeton University Press, 1988*); Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 8–10, 40–44.

⁹⁰Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 40–44; Latham, *Modernization as Ideology*, 59–67, 151–208.

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

Capitalism and capitalist institutions, in Mumfordian critique, worked contrary to genuine human needs for egalitarianism and ecological protection. Undoubtedly, technocratic institutions are machines, in the sense that they are organized for the express purposes of order and control. Almost without exception they are hierarchical and authoritarian in design.⁹¹

Public and Private Systems

All modern technocratic institutions share the essential objective of control. Control must be developed in the most effective manner, as measured by the standards of management developed for that institution and related ones. Control involves the management of environments and resources. The Department of the Army, as a technocratic organization, defines control with respect to its personnel, its weapons systems, and its integration and functions within the U.S. military establishment. Similar control structures define other national security institutions, both in the United States and internationally. Likewise, all national public institutions share common control methods and objectives, which are applications of policy science.⁹²

Private institutions, such as profit-making corporations, also establish systems for the control of resources and environments. The resources are most often human capital, and the environments are markets, as well as legal, regulatory, and political constraints. Multinational corporations, like nation-states, operate within the international environment. In this paradigm, both the institution itself and its environment are viewed as a planning domain. The essential objective for multinationals, like all technocratic organizations, has been to effect control in the most predictable and efficacious manner possible. Since this is not done by literary conventions, but by the application of management systems, the definition and quality of control must be quantified as precisely as possible. The modern corporation is driven to create order in its environment and to maximize its underlying objective, namely, profit.

The result of this technocratic impetus over the last century has been the creation of the liberal technocratic order as a constellation of public and private institutional systems. During the twentieth century, the relationship between these two systems, loosely called the public and private sectors, was sometimes adversarial, sometimes cooperative, depending upon the institutional and national scripts involved. In global terms, multinational corporations and nation-states, irrespective of their national political systems, maintained generally cooperative business arrangements. Both the multinational corporation and the state, whether the state was France or Italy or socialist Cuba, China, or the Soviet Union, established mutually reinforcing relationships for the expansion of national and international markets. The liberal script expanded industrial trade steadily,

⁹¹ Mumford, *The Pentagon of Power*, 230–377.

⁹² Kenneth Allard, *Command, Control, and the Common Defense* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1996), 241–64; *Joint Chiefs of Staff, Doctrine for Command, Control, Communications, and Computer (C4) Systems Support to Joint Operations* (Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1995).

through wars and revolutions, depressions and embargoes.⁹³ The institutional script for the liberal order built capitalism around the world. From the heavy industry of the second industrial revolution to the information-dense products of the post-1960s computer age, the engines of corporate capitalism applied the technologies of manufacturing, marketing, and finance. The socialist world could never compete.⁹⁴

Capitalism expanded and generated enormous amounts of wealth. Yet, the distribution of wealth was not equal, either within the developed countries or in the vast underdeveloped regions. This was in part due to the nature of capitalism, and in part to the rejection of markets and the application of socialist economics by Third World countries. The liberal script built a huge and abundant economic system for the richest segment of the world's population, but it failed to control the vast increase in poverty in the Third World. This was the bane of the liberal order as the century ended. Despite the exponential powers of Western technologies, the political divisions of global poverty threatened serious disorder. Altruism was not built into the institutions of the liberal technocratic order. The Judeo-Christian script called for it, but the Western metascript had more to do with global rationalization and control than with the fulfillment of humanitarian goals. Only with the destruction of September 11 did the redeemer nation reorient, seriously, toward the goal of eradicating world poverty. Only when faced with the trauma and fear of a global war with the worst kind of terrorists did the elite culture of the nation-state move expeditiously to create a truly sustainable international order.⁹⁵

⁹³John A. Mathews, *Dragon Multinational: A New Model for Global Growth* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 21–48; Paz Estrella Tolentino, *Multinational Corporations: Emergence and Evolution* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 421–46; Michael E. Porter, *The Competitive Advantage of Nations* (New York: Free Press, 1998); G. M. Hodgson, M. Itoh, and N. Yokokawa, eds., *Capitalism in Evolution: Global Connections—East and West* (Cheltenham, UK: Elgar, 2001).

⁹⁴Richard J. Hunter Jr., *From Autarchy to Market: Polish Economics and Politics, 1945–1995* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996); Simon Johnson and Gary Loveman, *Starting Over in Eastern Europe: Entrepreneurship and Economic Renewal* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1995); Paul Hare and Junior Davis, eds., *Transition to the Market Economy: Critical Perspectives on the World Economy*, 4 vols. (New York: Routledge, 1997).

⁹⁵Gunnar Myrdal, *The Challenge of World Poverty: A World Anti-poverty Program in Outline* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970), 341–85; Ted C. Lewellen, *Dependency and Development: An Introduction to the Third World* (Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey, 1995), 49–96; Gary S. Fields, *Distribution and Development: A New Look at the Developing World* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001); Dwight H. Perkins, ed., *Assisting Development in a Changing World: The Harvard Institute for International Development, 1980–1995* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997). For a libertarian critique of Keynesian development economics, see Doug Bandow and Ian Vasquez, eds., *Perpetuating Poverty: The World Bank, the IMF, and the Developing World* (Washington, DC: CATO Institute, 1994); Deepak Lal and H. Myint, *The Political Economy of Poverty, Equity and Growth: A Comparative Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 25–45.

The Market and the Corporate “Machine”

Markets and corporations are essential institutional systems for the technocratic age. Large modern corporations, endowed with accounting, statistics, and information-processing technologies, have been quintessentially technocratic institutions. Machinelike in most of their operations, they have sacrificed personable characteristics for the technocratic ethos of scientific order. The corporation has coexisted with the concept and physical reality of markets. In fact, both markets and corporations refer to interconnected material and analytical constructs. Both corporate and market institutions display enormous power through their respective abilities to communicate complex sets of information about economic value. The price mechanism common to all markets imputes value to all things defined by the market. The price of oil on global markets determines its economic value, which in turn has enormous consequences, economic and geopolitical.⁹⁶

Through the twentieth century, the private corporation grew at a rate commensurate with the exponential expansion of global trade, consumption, and the evolution of Western technology. In purely statistical terms, the Western corporate machine grew virtually unfettered. As an institutional form, it built ever larger, more integrated multinational enterprises. From one decade and one generation to the next, with the exception of the Great Depression, the market systems of the liberal technocratic order prospered as conduits of wealth and information. They developed as transactional systems for the articulation of both human needs and power. International markets became the most powerful of global information systems, dominated by ever more sophisticated and complex transnational corporate institutions. Through vast expansions in the nature and means of markets, their fundamental natures and the script for the institution and epistemology of capitalism remained essentially unchanged. Capitalism as an ideology and as an institutional structure was virtually synonymous with the liberal order. Its corporate institutions were dedicated to their own continuous expansion and accrual of resources. Multinational corporations, as a very large corporatist literature suggests, were dedicated to the service of a global script for the West—a script in which

⁹⁶For a mathematical analysis of market forces using modern microeconomic theory, see Franklin M. Fisher, *Microeconomics: Essay in Theories and Applications* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Donald Stevenson Watson and Malcolm Getz, *Price Theory and Its Uses* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993); George Philip, *The Political Economy of International Oil* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994); John Bacher, *Petrotyranny* (Toronto: Dundrun Press, 2000), 47–73; Jahangir Amazeqar, *Managing the Oil Wealth: OPEC’s Windfalls and Pitfalls* (New York: I. B. Taurus, 1999), 10–47, 204–51; J. E. Hartshorn, *Oil Trade: Politics and Prospects* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Siamack Shojai, ed., *The New Global Oil Market: Understanding Energy Issues in the World Economy* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995); Gregory P. Nowell, *Mercantile States and the World Oil Cartel, 1900–1939* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994); Simon Bromley, *American Hegemony and World Oil: The Industry, the State System and the World Economy* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1991).

corporate institutions became embedded within the nation-state, influencing state policies as well as transcending the state itself.⁹⁷

In *The Age of Extremes*, Eric Hobsbawm's synthesis of twentieth-century history, the corporate organizations of modern and postmodern industrialism became cardinal institutions in the West's metascript. European science and technology, that is, the technocratic epistemologies of Western thought, were spread throughout the world through the institutional devices of corporate capitalism. The interests of the West's grand narrative, the civilizing of the world, scripted capitalism to move aggressively outward from its bases in North America and Europe. Through a mixture of scientific and technological rationalism, the metascript fashioned private corporations as primary institutional forces. Their collective organizational mission was entirely consistent with the West's preternatural path of expansion. Why was this the script? The core of the West's narrative lies within its original mission, its *raison d'être*, whose origins lie in the millennia-old Judeo-Christian culture of European Christianity.⁹⁸

The organizational architecture of the modern corporation has always been by design functional, rational, and utilitarian. Despite vast changes in technology, markets, and the material culture of the West since the nineteenth century, a corporation's *modus operandi* under capitalism has not changed at all. As discussed, the methods and purposes of profit-seeking corporate institutions have to do with the acquisition, planning, and control of markets and resources. Utilitarian methods and rationality have their origins not in Judaism and Christianity, but in the classical thought of Greco-Roman civilization. In fact, the source of all Western technical and scientific thought runs linearly from the classical thought of Plato, Aristotle, and the other distinguished Greek and Roman scientists and philosophers. Revived during the Renaissance and further developed during

⁹⁷Tolentino, *Multinational Corporations*, 23–138; Robert Gopin, *Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 278–340; John H. Dunning, *Alliance Capitalism and Global Business* (New York: Routledge, 1997) and *Global Capitalism at Bay?* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Bijit Bora, “The Role of Multinational Corporations in Globalizing the World Economy: Evidence from Affiliates of U.S. Multinational Companies,” in Amnon Levy-Livemore, ed., *Handbook on the Globalization of the World Economy* (Northampton, MA: Elgar, 1998), 147–67; Alfred D. Chandler Jr., “Technological and Organizational Underpinnings of Modern Industrial Enterprise: The Dynamics of Competitive Advantage,” in James Foreman-Peck, ed., *Historical Foundations of Globalization* (Northampton, MA: Elgar, 1998), 445–69; Knick Harley, ed., *The Integration of the World Economy, 1850–1914*, 2 vols. (Brookfield, VT: Elgar, 1996).

⁹⁸Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes*, 257–86; Ralph C. Hancock, *Calvin and the Foundations of Modern Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 25–45; Peter Kaufman, *Redeeming Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990); Phillip E. Hammond, *The Protestant Presence in Twentieth-Century America: Religion and Political Culture* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); Robert R. Mathisen, ed., *Critical Issues in American Religious History: A Reader* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2001), 393–438.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

the Enlightenment and the industrial revolution, the utilitarian concept of the production of collective goods became the sine qua non of the technocratic age.⁹⁹

In the corporate machine, Aristotelian principles of rational control govern its technocratic architecture. Accounting and finance and other administrative systems honed for technical efficiency are the essential organizational and professional knowledge systems required for the survival of the firm. The convergence of culture and knowledge, organization and epistemology, characterize the corporate institution of the liberal order. In American capitalism, the synthesis came early in the nineteenth century; capitalism became multinational as the nation's interests and frontiers became global. Entirely consistent with the script, the West and capitalism moved outward. From the building of the Panama Canal and the monopoly-dominated corporate capitalism of the Progressive era, through the post-Cold War period, the expansion of Western corporate capitalism has been duly aggressive.¹⁰⁰

According to Polyani's famous work on nineteenth-century capitalism, *The Great Transformation*, the international system in its entirety was structured by the rise of corporate capitalism. Market forces shaped not only war but also the peace that governed Europe.¹⁰¹ The technocratic engine of corporate capitalism shaped the twentieth century through expansion. The compounded growth of the modern American economy, driven by heavy energy-intensive industry in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, created the behemoth of American power. America's oil industry, born in the mountains of Western Pennsylvania, had become a global force before the First World War. By the Second World War, petroleum was a vital element of military and industrial power. The international oil industry expanded into the Middle East and subsequently to every part of the world. Petroleum markets developed rapidly in the United States as consumers fed their appetites for a post-World War II society defined by abundance. The American political economy created vast suburbs around central cities and made the "highway

⁹⁹David Roochnik, *Of Art and Wisdom: Plato's Understanding of Techne* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1996), 273–82; Reviel Netz, *The Shaping of Deduction in Greek Mathematics: A Study in Cognitive History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Jonathan Lear, *Aristotle and Logical Theory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Patrick H. Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997). *The logical development of classical notions of science and techne can be found in recent quantitative models in management science and economics. See, for example, Anita Lee, Knowledge-Based Flexible Management Systems (FMS) Scheduling* (New York: Garland, 1994) and W. Brian Arthur, Steven N. Durlauf, and David A. Lane, eds., *The Economy as an Evolving Complex System II* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, Advanced Book Program, 1997).

¹⁰⁰Walter LaFeber, "The Tension between Democracy and Capitalism in the American Century," in Hogan, *The Ambiguous Legacy*, 152–82; Armand Mattelart, *Multinational Corporations and the Control of Culture: The Ideological Apparatuses of Imperialism* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1979); Lee Tavis, *Power and Responsibility: Multinational Managers and Developing Country Concerns* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 126–65.

¹⁰¹Michael Polanyi, *The Great Transformation* (New York: Rinehart, 1944), 3–19.

lobby” of the 1950s a reality. By the late twentieth century, the United States had become the quintessential postindustrial society, an information economy fueled by the hydrocarbon energy systems of the transnational oil industry.¹⁰²

As the global technocratic age blossomed, the American model spread to Western Europe and elsewhere. Capitalism’s efficiencies were admired not only in the West, but also even in the communist camp, where “Fordism” helped the Soviet Union survive the Second World War. Despite the evident success of the American political economy, the modern progressive critique of the system remained intact. American critics of industrial capitalism perceived that there was a broad collusion of oil, steel, and automobile sectors in the creation of a profligate consumer society. Nonetheless, critics of the new private-sector technocracy, such as Galbraith, Harrington, Boulding, and Nader, saw their assessment eclipsed by the promise of even higher consumption, enabled by ever greater and greater sources of supply.¹⁰³ Despite the oil crises of the 1970s, the American petroleum culture survived and indeed grew. Like all other modern capitalist industries, the international oil industry used the epistemologies of the firm, complex, and well-defined engineering and administrative knowledge systems to build its global regime. To remedy its problems, the postindustrial world of the middle and late Cold War period relied increasingly on the established scientific and technical cultures.¹⁰⁴ Aristotelian technocratic knowledge drove the institutional systems of capitalism and the capitalist state. However, the corporate culture, based so much on the technocratic, was also connected to the Judeo-Christian mission of the United States. With the exception of a brief period at the turn of the century when the populist creed was influential, the expansion of capitalism was always viewed by American elites as coterminous with American redemption. Spreading the market also meant the diffusion of democracy. The

¹⁰²Anthony Sampson, *The Seven Sisters: The Great Oil Companies and the World They Shaped* (New York: Cornet, 1993); Nowell, *Mercantile States and the World Oil Cartel*, 223–79; Stephen Howarth, *A Century in Oil: The “Shell” Transport and Trading Company, 1897–1997* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1997); Robert Engler, *The Brotherhood of Oil: Energy Policy and the Public Interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977); Robert Caro, *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York* (New York: Vintage Books, 1975), 895–958.

¹⁰³For Cold War–era critical political economy, see, for example, John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Affluent Society* (London: H. Hamilton, 1958) and *The New Industrial State* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967); Ralph Nader, Mark Green, and Joel Seligman, *Taming the Giant Corporation* (New York: Norton, 1976); Michael Harrington, *The Other America: Poverty in the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1962); Kenneth Boulding, *A Reconstruction of Economics* (New York: Wiley, 1950) and *Ecodynamics: A New Theory of Societal Evolution* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981).

¹⁰⁴Eliezer Geisler, *Methodology, Theory, and Knowledge in the Managerial and Organizational Sciences: Actions and Consequences* (Westport, CT: Quorum, 1999); Bernard Taylor, *Introduction to Management Science*, 7th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002); Samuel Humes, *Managing the Multinational: Confronting the Global-Local Dilemma* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1993); George Stonehouse, *Global and Transnational Business: Strategy and Management* (New York: Wiley, 2000).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

liberal technocratic ideology was anchored upon this precept, and it worked from the 1940s through the 1990s.¹⁰⁵

In international corporate capitalism, American nationality encountered the technocratic order directly. National interests, defined by the national script, coalesced with the technocratic agenda of the supranational firm. The technocratic basis of political economy merged with and was subsumed under the national script for redemption. The corporate machine both acquiesced with and advanced through the actions of the state. In its confrontation with OPEC over geostrategic control of the Persian Gulf in the 1970s and 1980s, “Big Oil” had political clout, but so did its rivals. Since the price of gasoline went directly to the public’s wallet, anti-oil politics was easy to mobilize. Big Oil’s script was matched to the scripts of public interest groups that attacked the international petroleum industry on the grounds of its general legitimacy. It was not hard for the neopopulist script, which resonated with environmentalists and other interest groups, to argue that a greater public interest existed in decoupling the energy industry from its position of power within the state. The public interest found in the national script was premised upon the preservation of the national image of liberty and egalitarianism. It was America’s self-concept that it was God’s redeemer—that the mission of America and Americanism was to build a society which would establish a new Zion dedicated to egalitarian freedom and prosperity. Lacking a more direct connection than freedom of capital, Big Oil, like “Big Tobacco” and other ostensibly formidable corporate powers, had to submit itself to public opinion.¹⁰⁶

Populist opposition to big business has had a long tradition in American politics. It was a constant theme of twentieth-century America that powers far greater than could be easily imagined or understood controlled American society from above. Therefore, it was incumbent upon the national leadership to take measures continuously to check the growth of corporate and government powers that militated against a populist conception of American society. The machinelike nature of the modern corporation violated the essential concept of freedom. Yet the corporation was invaluable to the development of national power. The Western metascript and the American national script conflicted on the nature of Americanism.

In the end, however, the American script incorporated the corporate machine. The redeemer nation would find salvation in its globalism. The various “corporatist”

¹⁰⁵Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962); Irving Kristol, *Two Cheers for Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 1978); David McClelland, *The Achieving Society* (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1961); Julian Simon, *Effort, Opportunity, and Wealth* (New York: Blackwell, 1987); W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Noncommunist Manifesto* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1960); Peter Drucker, *Marketing and Economic Development* (Philadelphia: American Marketing Association, 1957); Kim Ezra Shienbaum, *American Shockwave: Entrepreneurial Capitalism and Its Global Impact* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002).

¹⁰⁶Engler, *The Brotherhood of Oil*; Sampson, *The Seven Sisters*, 269–82; Bromley, *American Hegemony and World Oil*, 124–62.

treatments of twentieth-century U.S. foreign relations are quite accurate in their assessments. For most of the century, the institutional structures of the corporate and government sectors coexisted in a collaborative effort to expand their mutual interests.¹⁰⁷ Energy, transport vehicles, telecommunications, information technology, management consulting, investment and commercial banking, pharmaceuticals, and agribusiness, as well as aerospace and other defense-related industries, to name the most important sectors, engaged in the vast enterprise of market integration or globalization that typified the technocratic age. By the end of the Cold War, the intellectual and capital resources of major multinational corporations far exceeded those of potential rivals from the socialist world or the public sector under global liberalism. The liberal technocratic order linked the state and the corporation in a matrix not only of power and mutual interest, but also of shared epistemological foundations. It evolved an elite culture of legal code and administrative science, along with scientific and technical knowledge of human and physical systems that united strategic planning for the private with the public sector.¹⁰⁸

The “market script” has been most fully developed in the corporatist literature. The narrative for the world petroleum market bears directly on the technocratic order and the machinations of the liberal technocratic script. During the 1950s and 1960s, the orthodox period of the Cold War, the exploration, distribution, and production of Middle East oil advanced the mutual interests of Western economic and political elites. Oil’s strategic value merged with its fundamental economic value to the Cold War economic system of the West. This became more and more apparent as Persian Gulf oil became a vital national security interest by the 1970s. The market for Middle Eastern oil became a basic factor in the global defense posture of the redeemer nation. The primacy of petroleum did not give the private-sector institutions controlling its distribution in the United States plenary control over public policy. However, the political economy of capitalism was “controlling” in the nature of the strategic response to a perceived threat to the Persian Gulf.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 1–25; Emily Rosenberg, *World War I and the Growth of United States Predominance in Latin America* (New York: Garland, 1987) and *Financial Missionaries to the World: The Politics and Culture of Dollar Diplomacy, 1900–1930* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Mary Nolan, *Visions of Modernity: American Business and the Modernization of Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 58–82; Robert F. Himmelberg, ed., *Business-Government Cooperation, 1917–1932: The Rise of Corporatist Policies* (New York: Garland, 1994); James Weinstein, *The Corporate Ideal and the Liberal State, 1900–1918* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1968); Joan Hoff-Wilson, *American Business and Foreign Policy, 1920–1933* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973); Walter LaFeber, *The American Search for Opportunity, 1865–1913* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

¹⁰⁸Daniel Bromley, *Economic Interests and Institutions: The Conceptual Foundations of Public Policy* (New York: Blackwell, 1989); Frank Fisher, *Evaluating Public Policy* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1995), 206–40; Beryl A. Radin, *Beyond Machiavelli: Policy Analysis Comes of Age* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000), 109–29.

¹⁰⁹Jeffrey Record, *The Rapid Deployment Force and U.S. Military Intervention in the Persian Gulf* (Cambridge, MA: Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, 1983), 1–17; Bassam Tibi, *Conflict*

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

The same confluence of interests can be seen in the development of the U.S. information technology industry during the Cold War. High-speed computers were first conceived and financed before and during the Second World War for their potential military applications. The same linkage between research and application funded several more generations of computer systems as the Cold War created an insatiable demand by the government for data processing technology. The computer industry was financed through direct Department of Defense contracts for basic research in transistor and semiconductor electronics as well as purchases of generation after generation of processing systems needed to control the nuclear and conventional war systems of the Pentagon. By the 1970s, information science had become a core element of all advanced technologies, and by the 1990s, virtually the only element that defined high-level technology.¹¹⁰

Over decades of technological revolution and industrial expansion, the list of technologies that linked the state with the private sector became nearly endless. With the “race to the moon,” NASA’s manned space program galvanized public opinion during the 1960s. Its large-scale engineering project connected directly to the Pentagon’s strategic planning for the technocratic organization not only of outer space but also of the global environment in toto. Still, it was yet another very prominent example of the connection between public and private institutions within the technocratic narrative. Certainly, with respect to the dramaturgy of the Cold War, the landing on the moon was a fine moment. Neil Armstrong’s remark upon becoming the first person to step on the surface of another celestial body, “That’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind,” was made behind the institutional and political reality of that footstep. Once more, the act of an American astronaut and military officer setting his feet on the moon

and War in the Middle East, 1967–91: Regional Dynamic and the Superpowers (*New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993*), 133–86; Robert J. Lieber, “Middle East Oil and the Industrial Democracies: In Conflict and Cooperation in the Aftermath of the Oil Shocks,” in Samuel F. Wells and Mark A. Bruzonsky, eds., *Security in the Middle East: Regional Change and Great Power Strategies* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987), 217–35; U.S. Congress, *House Committee on Foreign Affairs (Hearings)* U.S. Interests in, and Policies toward, the Persian Gulf, 1980 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1980); Zbigniew Brzezinski, *In Quest of National Security* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988), 177–79.

¹¹⁰Raul Rojas and Alf Hagen, eds., *The First Computers: History and Architectures* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000); Paul E. Ceruzzi, *A History of Modern Computing* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000); Michael R. Williams, *A History of Computing Technology* (Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Computer Society Press, 1997); Steven Metz, *Armed Conflict in the 21st Century: The Information Revolution and Post-modern Warfare* (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2000); Stuart J. D. Schwartzstein, ed., *The Information Revolution and National Security: Dimensions and Directions* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1996).

and planting the American flag signified the technological, scientific, and organizational strengths of the United States as a global force in world civilization.¹¹¹

Private contractors had built almost everything that the space program put into space. The technical knowledge that enabled the trip was acquired over several decades of research and practical applications in ballistics, fuel systems, data processing, and military coordination for launching and retrieving space vehicles. In strategic terms, the NASA program expanded the domain of the national security state. In political terms, it was a brilliant propaganda victory over the Soviets. It demonstrated to the international community the evident superiority of the American effort vis-à-vis the Soviets, and hence suggested capitalism's inherent superiority. Domestically, the moon landing buoyed American nationalism when it appeared deeply shaken by the Vietnam War.¹¹²

At the level of the metascript, the technocratic narrative continued the expansion of the epistemological and institutional foundations of a global culture. The long view of history—notably, world systems theory—demands a perspective that understands state and corporate institutions as mere epiphenomena that express the underlying structural movements of the world's economic system. Clearly, the Western metascript was driving the multinational corporation in the direction of ever increasing global market power and control. The script for the redeemer nation imagined its corporate institutions as agents of an American-defined commercial world in which international branding held no bounds. As a matter of natural course, the multinational corporation and the public sector continued their political and intellectual collusion. The epistemological matrix for the West that developed new knowledge, specifically technocratic knowledge, survived the Vietnam War, and in the late Cold War it blossomed.¹¹³

The Reagan Revolution, which will be discussed in detail toward the end of this book, promoted a revitalization of the concept of the market. The power of the public sector was checked by a new ideological emphasis upon deregulating markets on a vast scale.

¹¹¹Walter A. McDougall, *The Heavens and the Earth: A Political History of the Space Age* (New York: Basic Books, 1985); Asif A. Siddiqi, *Challenge to Apollo: The Soviet Union and the Space Race, 1945–1974* (Washington, DC: NASA, 2000); Robert Reeves, *The Superpower Space Race: An Explosive Rivalry through the Solar System* (New York: Plenum Press, 1994), 101–66; James Schefter, *The Race: The Uncensored Story of America's Battle to Beat Russia to the Moon* (London: Century, 1999).

¹¹²McDougall, *The Heavens and the Earth*, 412–13.

¹¹³Frederick Allen, *Secret Formula: How Brilliant Marketing and Relentless Salesmanship Made Coca-Cola the Best-Known Product in the World* (New York: Harper Business, 1994); Mark Pendergast, *For God, Country, and Coca-Cola: The Definitive History of the Great American Soft Drink and the Company That Makes It* (New York: Basic Books, 2000); James L. Watson, ed., *Golden Arches East: McDonald's in East Asia* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997); James Wallace, *Overdrive: Bill Gates and the Race to Control Cyberspace* (New York: Wiley, 1997); Paul Andrews, *How the Web Was Won: Microsoft from Windows to the Web: The Inside Story of How Bill Gates and His Band of Internet Idealists Transformed a Software Empire* (New York: Broadway Books, 1999); Bob Ortega, *In Sam We Trust: The Untold Story of Sam Walton and Wal-Mart, the World's Most Powerful Retailer* (New York: Times Business, 2000).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Internationally, the Reagan message was consonant with the end of socialism, whether Marxist-Leninist or other versions, as a viable strategy for economic growth and development.¹¹⁴

During the Reagan era, the strength of pro-business doctrine in federal agencies was overwhelming. In the United States, business and public sector nearly became one. The interrelated and positive nature of the relationship between the American state and the multinational corporation was ideologically confirmed. The interlocking corporate and public-sector leaderships and the new Republican administration blurred the line between the state and the multinational corporation. In effect, asking if there was a difference between corporate interests and national interests was no longer a reasonable question. The production of technocratic knowledge for a new, aggressive American globalism that dually promoted military and economic expansion was sanctioned by Reaganite ideology. The New Left cringed at the resurgence of the radical right in American politics. However, this was all part of the narrative. With the end of the revisionist Cold War, the New Left as an ideological movement was moribund.¹¹⁵

The State “Machine”: The “Military-Industrial Complex” or the “National Security State”

At the height of the Cold War the United States devoted a tenth of its economic output to national defense. Peacetime budgets funded new weapons systems that revolutionized the nature of the balance of power. It seemed, and Eisenhower’s farewell address stated so directly, that a “military-industrial complex” had emerged. President Eisenhower’s warning is famous not only for its candor but for its encapsulation of the institutional history of the times. The description of a domestic conspiracy, involving the power elite (described by C. Wright Mills only a few years before), to threaten democracy with a permanent militarized state was striking and ironic. The most senior and distinguished of American generals and the outgoing president of the United States denounced the postwar institutionalization of a military production system deemed essential to the

¹¹⁴Margaretha von Troil, ed., *Changing Paradigms in Development: South, East and West: A Meeting of Minds in Africa* (Uppsala, Sweden: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, 1993); John A. James and Mark Thomas, eds., *Capitalism in Context: Essays on Economic Development and Cultural Change in Honor of R. M. Hartwell* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Richard M. Bird and Susan Horton, eds., *Government Policy and the Poor in Developing Countries* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989); Dwight H. Perkins and Michael Roemer, eds., *Reforming Economic Systems in Developing Countries* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Institute for Economic Development, 1991); *United States Agency for International Development, Mobilizing Local Resources for Economic Development in an Urbanizing Africa* (Nairobi, Kenya: USAID, 1990).

¹¹⁵John P. Diggins, *The Rise and Fall of the American Left* (New York: Norton, 1992), 342–83; Stephen F. Hayward, *The Age of Reagan: The Fall of the Old Liberal Order, 1964–1980* (Roseville, CA: Forum/Prima, 2001), 535–608; William C. Berman, *America’s Right Turn: From Nixon to Clinton* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 60–118; John Ehrman, *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs, 1945–1994* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 137–72.

containment doctrine of the Cold War. In the ensuing decade of the Vietnam War, the more common term in popular discourse became the “national security state,” whose connotation, equally demonic, suggested an integrated system of control over society for the purposes of imperial expansion. In fact, the national security state, or, to be more neutral, national security system or structure, was an accurate term for the multilayered global stratagems required of a world power. From the perspective of twentieth-century political, diplomatic, and military historians, whether the policies of often-Byzantine complexity were efficacious, moral, or strikingly immoral was beside the point. The concept of an institutional system devoted exclusively to the management of the totality of a world power’s foreign relations remains a quintessential analytical device for international relations.¹¹⁶

The American national security state has its origins as far back as the mid-nineteenth century. However, it became a fully operational reality during the First World War. The necessity of projecting national power globally required the development of an institutional system that could integrate the production and strategic deployment of military resources as well as coordinate the political and diplomatic strategies attendant on a large-scale international war. The Wilson administration’s national security regime did not reach the level of integration that later systems of the Second World War and the Cold War would reach. The Second World War was much longer and required even greater war mobilization than the First. Roosevelt’s national security state not only took it upon itself to organize an entire society of more than 130 million people for war, but created the military and civilian institutions that sent the enormous armies, navies, and air forces of the United States into combat over the entire circumference of the earth’s surface.¹¹⁷

As a planning system, the Second World War’s national security state reached impressive proportions. American planners were not only involved in every aspect of domestic war mobilization; they were also engaged in the coordinated political, economic, strategic, and tactical aspects of coalition warfare against the Axis powers.

¹¹⁶Hogan, *The Marshall Plan and A Cross of Iron*; Kurt Hackemer, *The U.S. Navy and the Origins of the Military-Industrial Complex, 1847–1883* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2001), 137; Gary E. Weir, *Forged in War: The Naval-Industrial Complex and American Submarine Construction, 1940–1961* (Washington, DC: Naval Historical Center, 1993); Sam C. Sarkesian, *U.S. National Security: Policymakers, Processes, and Politics* (Boulder, CO: Rienner, 1995); Stephen A. Cambone, *A New Structure for National Security Policy Planning* (Washington, DC: CSIS Press, 1998), 48–90; Carnes Lord, *The Presidency and the Management of National Security* (New York: Free Press, 1988); Amy B. Zegart, *Flawed by Design: The Evolution of the CIA, JCS, and NSC* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999); David F. Rudgers, *Creating the Secret State: The Origins of the Central Intelligence Agency, 1943–1947* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000); Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones, *The CIA and American Democracy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); Joseph J. Trento, *The Secret History of the CIA* (Roseville, CA: Forum, 2001).

¹¹⁷Kimball, *The Juggler*, 8–19; Dallek, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy*, 317–61.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The machinelike qualities of the war's national security institutions built the largest array of weapons and weapons systems in the history of warfare. In less than four years, the United States built more than one thousand destroyer escorts, one hundred aircraft carriers, and three hundred thousand planes of all types. The quantity and types of military production, as well as their supply to the Allied coalition, remains a stunning example of wartime productivity.¹¹⁸

In a real sense, the economic, political, and military institutions of the Second World War, not only in the United States but in all the major combatant nations, were machinelike. Battles and campaigns were fought and won by fierce fighting between infantrymen, sailors, and airmen who gave their lives, but the scope of the warfare was technocratic and industrial. The desperate assaults against enemy lines by starving armies and the horrific bombing campaigns conducted against civilian populations suggested the extreme privations and brutality of a conflict fought in "modern times." During the huge land battles on the German-Russian front, thousands of artillery guns shot simultaneously, barraging their adversaries with the lethality of industrial-age warfare. The attacks were systematic and repetitive as well as deadly.¹¹⁹

The point of analysis here is the nature of the warfare being waged. It was first and foremost a standoff between the comparative factory productions of the opposing nations. At the start of the war against Russia, the Germans swept into the Soviet Union with the high-quality military weapons produced by German factories. By 1943, the same German forces that had moved onto the great Russian plains with such ferocity in 1941 were thwarted at the battle of Kursk by Soviet forces now reinforced with far better weapons manufactured by the Soviets as well as their coalition allies. The Wehrmacht was beaten out of Russia and finally destroyed by the combined expeditionary forces of the United Nations. In victory, the national security states of the winners, the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, deployed their respective institutional assets to the task of

¹¹⁸Donald Marr Nelson, *Arsenal of Democracy: The Story of American War Production* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1946); R. Elberton Smith, *The Army and Economic Mobilization* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1959), 3–31; Robert Connery, *The Navy and the Industrial Mobilization in World War II* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1951); Alan L. Gropman, *Mobilizing U.S. Industry in World War II: Myth and Reality* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1996); V. R. Cardozier, *The Mobilization of the United States in World War II: How the Government, Military, and Industry Prepared for War* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1995), 131–58.

¹¹⁹Allan Clark, *Barbarossa: The Russian-German Conflict, 1941–45* (New York: William Morrow Books, 1965), 166–219; Omer Bartov, *The Eastern Front, 1941–45: German Troops and the Barbarization of Warfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 106–41; Earnest Klink, "The Military Concept of the War against the Soviet Union," in *Institute for Military History, Germany and the Second World War*, vol. 4, *The Attack on the Soviet Union* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 223–325.

finishing the war against the Japanese and reconstituting the international system to match their own designs.¹²⁰

The global confrontation between capitalism and socialism created the institutional structure that generated a significant literature in the 1950s and 1960s. The military-industrial complex was the organizational basis for the epistemologies of the Cold War as it developed. The language of the American Cold War and the national security knowledge systems that shaped postwar physical science, engineering, social science, and the humanities, were connected physically and intellectually to the institutional complex of the Pentagon and what was known as the “Washington establishment.” From Washington and the outlying centers of national security work, namely, major university centers, policy institutes, government laboratories, and war colleges, modernization theory, nuclear strategy, and space engineering and computer systems, along with counterinsurgency and conventional war doctrines, were developed into programmatic designs for global management.¹²¹

The national security state was instrumental in designing the path of American intervention in Vietnam. It structured the incremental deployments as well as the escalation and de-escalations of the Johnson and Nixon administrations. Surviving the war intact, the institutional framework for U.S. national security restructured during the last two decades of the Cold War. As the knowledge systems that governed the Cold War became more and more quantitative, the institutions responded commensurately. By the time Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980, the epistemology of the Cold War had become ever more mathematical—that is, technocratic—in its applications. The Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) was the apogee of the technocratic expansion of the Cold War. Its adoption represented the expanded prestige and funding that the formal and informal institutions of U.S. national security received in the wake of the Reagan presidency and the consequent reorientation of the American script. In the end, the national security state “won” the Cold War by developing a more effective technocratic system than the Soviets could hope to compete with.¹²²

¹²⁰Gerhard Weinberg, *A World at Arms: A Global History of WWII* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 780–841; John Keegan, *The Second World War* (London: Pimlico, 1997).

¹²¹Leslie Gelb and Richard K. Betts, *The Irony of Vietnam: The System Worked* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1979), 347–69; Perry Smith, *Creating Strategic Vision: Long-Range Planning for National Security* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1987); Amos A. Jordan, *American National Security* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Geir Lundestad, “Empire” by Integration: The United States and European Integration (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); Patrick De Souza, ed., *Economic Strategy and National Security: A Next Generation Approach* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000); Michael E. Brown, ed., *America’s Strategic Choices* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000).

¹²²Edward Reiss, *The Strategic Defense Initiative* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Ashton B. Carter and David N. Schwartz, eds., *Ballistic Missile Defense* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1984); Gary L. Guertner and Donald M. Snow, *The Last Frontier: An Analysis of the Strategic Defense Initiative* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

In the immediate post–Cold War world, the institutional structure of American internationalism remained nearly unchanged. Clearly, the operational missions for national security changed with the restructuring of the international system. Yet, the Department of Defense, the State Department, the National Security Agency, and other key federal cabinet departments and agencies, as well as the whole private-sector labyrinth of connected institutions, maintained themselves as they were. The epistemology of the Cold War was deconstructed. No longer did the state attempt to order American society and global containment strategy to “defend the free world,” as it did during the early Cold War and later. The emerging post–Cold War national security epistemology was far less focused on great power warfare. Instead, the neo-Wilsonian concerns of international development, democracy, and global cooperation gained legitimacy at the expense of the ideology of military realism. The death of communism and the parallel capitalist explosion of the 1990s coincided with the scientific revolutions in telecommunications, computer science, and human genetics. The new national security state had to deal with the new issues of the new age: globalization (i.e., modernization); terrorism; chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons proliferation; and endless internecine regional conflicts. The institutional challenge now was how to order a world that could not be ordered. How could the liberal technocratic regime of the developed world solve the immense problems of the undeveloped world? In the end, Marx and Lenin had lost to the market. But had the market won? The Washington establishment could only hope.¹²³

The Scripts and Metascripts

Scripts at all levels of human interaction must show certain degrees of plasticity. They cannot be static without risking failure and disappearance. Individual and collective narratives must be able to adapt to environmental change. Adaptive behavior will not usually change scripts in their entirety, to the point where the purpose of the script and the role of the actor are no longer recognizable. A Samurai warrior in Tokugawa Japan would not adapt his role by becoming a commoner or a convert to Christianity. To do so would mean the abandonment of his role in traditional Japanese society; he would, in effect, be replacing one script for another. However, the transformation of Japanese society, beginning with first the Meiji restoration of 1868 and then the American

¹²³Susan C. Stokes, *Mandates and Democracy: Neoliberalism by Surprise in Latin America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 122–53; John L. Campbell and Ove K. Pedersen, eds., *The Rise of Neoliberalism and Institutional Analysis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001); Pádraig Carmody, *Tearing the Social Fabric: Neoliberalism, Deindustrialization, and the Crisis of Governance in Zimbabwe* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2001); Ankie Hoogvelt, *Globalization and the Postcolonial World: The New Political Economy of Development* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 94–162; Priyatosh Maitra, *The Globalization of Capitalism in Third World Countries* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996), 85–130; George DeMartino, *Global Economy, Global Justice: Theoretical Objections and Policy Alternatives to Neoliberalism* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 152–89.

occupation of 1945, was an immense adaptation of Japanese civilization to the West. Yet, despite the modernization and Westernization of its culture on a vast scale, the essence of Japan's scripted cultural narrative remained intact. This was so much the case that more than half a century after the American occupation, Japan was viewed as still quite surprisingly unassimilated to contemporary cosmopolitan Western culture.¹²⁴

Where the script changes into its antithesis, as we see in the transformation of Germany's politics and culture after the Second World War, it may be surmised that the national script has been replaced by its diametric opposite, or counterscript. National scripts move through historical time capturing the elements of national identity and purpose from one generation to the next. There is almost always continuity in a nation's history, no matter how heterogeneous the society. Hence, the same patterns of success and failure that individuals experience revisit a nation as well. Sometimes, however, the script's path changes in response to critical events. An individual, group, or nation encounters an extraordinary event, and its impact restructures the narrative. Clearly, the German script changed with the outcome of the Second World War. Nazi militarism, racism, and extreme nationalism were stripped from public life and, in the Federal Republic, replaced with the social liberalism of postwar West Germany. The German counterscript, which still struggles with the lingering elements of the old Nazi one, recreated German society as a progressive liberal nation, determinedly self-conscious in its acceptance of war guilt and the legacies of Adolf Hitler.¹²⁵

The German and Japanese scripts were but two of scores of national scripts altered, transformed, or destroyed by the Second World War. There were also the American, Russian, Chinese, Jewish, French, and Polish scripts, to mention some of the most salient. The major world conflict of the 1930s and 1940s affected all of these national scripts deeply and permanently. The Second World War organized the world into a metascript for the new convergence of the West with the remainder of the world's civilizations. Large-scale international wars, and indeed wars of all kinds, are most often transformational events. Major wars and economic crises work themselves into the scripts and metascripts of individuals, groups, institutions, nation-states, and civilizations. Collectively, the scripts of nation-states are connected within regional "conflict systems" or metascripts. Metascripts govern world history. They establish relationships among nation-states and lead them over centuries to an arranged path. Indeed, there does not have to be anything good or benevolent about them. The Jewish Holocaust was scripted over centuries, bringing European, Jewish, and world civilizations to converge on the tragedy of industrial genocide in Central Europe. The religious wars, invasions, and

¹²⁴Ivan P. Hall, *Cartels of the Mind: Japan's Intellectual Closed Shop* (New York: Norton, 1998); Patrick Smith, *Japan: A Reinterpretation* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1997).

¹²⁵Alfons Heck, *The Burden of Hitler's Legacy* (Frederick, CO: Renaissance House, 1988); Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Vintage Books, 1997), 27–79; Stephan and Norbert Lebert, *My Father's Keeper: Children of Nazi Leaders: An Intimate History of Damage and Denial* (Boston: Little, Brown, 2001).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

catastrophic declines of civilizations, as well as the rise to glory of the same civilizations, are scripted through centuries and even millennia. However, this does not explain why and when scripts turn in one direction or another.¹²⁶

In the modern Western metascript the turn of that script was connected not only to cataclysmic major wars, but also to much shorter but extremely intense crises. The phenomenon of crisis management and control as a vector for the larger dimensions of a country's collective narrative became more apparent after the Second World War, with the rising threat of nuclear Armageddon. Only then, with the emergence of a global mass media and the immediate possibility of nuclear holocaust, did the idea for critical moments in foreign or domestic policy become plausible. Television, an extraordinary invention for the communication of immediate visual images of the world, also magnified crises in the public's mind to an exceptional degree. One of the classic examples of this was the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.¹²⁷ The technocratic age magnified the dimensions of mass communications and their impact upon the global and national narratives of the Cold War. In an age with both immediate public knowledge as well as public danger, the work of a crisis could affect the nature of international relations within days. A nation's script could turn on what was seen on television, and this happened often, from the Tet offensive of 1968 to the images of the Russian "White House" during the summer of 1991. The Cold War and the immediate post-Cold War world were strewn with short and potentially catastrophic crises involving superpower confrontations. In foreign policy crises, the full dimensions of a script show themselves. Each of the many participants, whether they are national statesmen, government bureaucrats, members of Congress or Parliament, or senior military officers involved in the "fog of war," is connected to a transnational narrative. In the final analysis, national scripts are actually the collective actions of vast numbers of major and minor individuals who express what must be expressed according to their own personal life narratives and the requirements of the crises' metascript.¹²⁸

¹²⁶Klaus P. Fischer, *The History of an Obsession: German Judeophobia and the Holocaust* (New York: Continuum, 1998), 21–50, 120–53; Roberto Finzi, *Anti-Semitism: From Its European Roots to the Holocaust* (New York: Interlink Books, 1999); James Carroll, *Constantine's Sword: The Church and the Jews: A History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001), 100–219; Lionel B. Steiman, *Paths to Genocide: Anti-Semitism in Western History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 1–70, 212–35; Joshua Trachtenberg, *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism* (1943; reprint, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1983); Arthur Hertzberg and Aron Hirt-Manheimer, *Jews: The Essence and Character of a People* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1998), 13–64.

¹²⁷Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: Longman, 1999); Robert Weisbrot, *Maximum Danger: Kennedy, the Missiles, and the Crisis of American Confidence* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2001); Mark White, *The Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996).

¹²⁸Michael Hunt, *Crises in U.S. Foreign Policy: An International History Reader* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996); Patrick J. Haney, *Organizing for Foreign Policy Crises: Presidents, Advisers, and the Management of Decision Making* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan

When Khrushchev pounded his shoe on the desk at the United Nations, or when Kennedy implored an audience of Berliners to believe that indeed he was one of them, the use of theatrics was deliberate. Yet, the staged performances of leaders, such as Hitler at his popular rallies and during his long speeches at the Nazi Reichstag, were only particular moments of political theater. Theater also extended to the war related decisions in the innumerable planning meetings Hitler held in his underground bunkers. In Hitler's mind, as in the minds of most of his important adversaries, reality was a social construct. Hitler and his inner circle assumed a worldview with the Reich at its center. The human race was strictly hierarchical, as Nazi plans for eugenics and genocide made plain. The weltanschauung of German fascists worked into the Nazi script dominated by paranoia and ruthless militarism. Yet, this was all an organized psychodrama, albeit pathological.¹²⁹

The scripts followed by Winston Churchill and his colleagues and those followed by the French, Americans, Russians, Japanese, Chinese, and so on, were referenced by their respective cultural systems and the narrative constructions of their worlds in the midst of the Second World War. Each national community had to come to terms with a perspective on the global conflict that was uniquely its own, both during the war and afterward. No one understood the war from the same perspective as the Czechoslovaks, who found their country betrayed and invaded from all sides.¹³⁰ The war's narrative was unique for the Poles, who faced the onslaught of the German army alone in September 1939 and then witnessed the Soviet invasion from its eastern frontier.¹³¹ The great magnitude of the world war as narrative was very different for the French, who lost in 1940 and had to cope with the division of the French empire into Vichy and Free French sides.¹³² It was quite different for the Japanese, who viewed themselves first as victims

Press, 1997), 1–22; Ian Ang, *Living Room Wars: Rethinking Media Audiences for a Postmodern World* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 150–80; Carla Brooks Johnston, *Global News Access: The Impact of New Communications Technologies* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), 95–153; David Demers and K. Viswanath, eds., *Mass Media, Social Control, and Social Change: A Macrosocial Perspective* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1999); Gabriel Weimann, *Communicating Unreality: Modern Media and the Reconstruction of Reality* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000), 243–319; Justin Lewis, *Constructing Public Opinion: How Political Elites Do What They Like and Why We Seem to Go Along with It* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 138–66.

¹²⁹ Joachim Kohler, *Wagner's Hitler: The Prophet and His Disciple* (New York: Blackwell, 2000), 57–66, 269–95; Hermann Glaser, *The Cultural Roots of National Socialism* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978); Cuthbert Carson Mann, *Hitler's Three Struggles: The Neo-pagan Revenge* (Evanston, IL: Chicago Spectrum Press, 1995).

¹³⁰ George Eric Rowe, *Betrayal in Central Europe: Austria and Czechoslovakia: The Fallen Bastions* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939), 381–507.

¹³¹ Jozef Garlinski, *Poland in the Second World War* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1985), 11–39.

¹³² Bertram M. Gordon, *Collaborationism in France during the Second World War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980), 17–89; Martin Marix Evans, *The Fall of France: Act with Daring* (Oxford: Osprey, 2000).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

and then as victors, but in the end victims of not only the West but of themselves. The public history of the conflict is far too immense to discuss in one chapter or one book. Suffice it to say that many thousands or millions of narratives, on different levels, describe the infinite dimensions of the Second World War. In sum, though, the disparate narratives, group and collective, organized a postwar reality that historians and political scientists continue to address on a daily basis.¹³³

Churchill and the British public saw the war within the framework of Britain's narrative for national survival. The same idea applied to the French, Russian, Polish, Dutch, Danish, and other national narratives over the course of the Second World War. In each national culture, the war developed around the people in a bewildering and terrifying display of modern warfare. The combatant nations, which numbered in the dozens by the war's end, were compelled to act as the orchestration of the global war commanded them. So, without more deliberation than was required by strategic and operational concerns, entire national populations were mobilized. In the United States, a country ensconced in determined isolationism at the very start of the war in Europe, more than 10 percent of the total population had enlisted in the armed forces by the war's conclusion. The economy, which normally devoted 1 percent of its production to the military, soon increased that amount to 50 percent of gross national product. The war swept tens of millions of individuals into highly organized systems of military mobilization. It brought the issues that surrounded national self-interest and survival and the collective structure of the international system to the immediate center of individual consciousness. Every thinking person on earth knew what the war was being fought for. It was most simply a struggle for control of the world.¹³⁴

Once more, the analogy posed by the space satellite images deserves restatement. Just as from the vantage point of near space the continents exist only as physical structures in geologic time, so the inner perspectives on the world that divide nations as well as individuals are hidden from view. The human world is constructed physically and psychically within our cerebral cortexes. An essential part of the efficacy of the script as an instrument for human action lies in its unconscious nature. Scripts would not work if humans transcended their entrapments and understood, at the deepest level, their connections to larger historical and culturally based systems. We may be able to sketch the outlines of the geophysical world that we live in, and we may also be able to divine the context of our personal and collective existence, but the larger structures that effect the scripted basis for different levels of society remain elusive and transcendent.

¹³³Patrick Brogan, *World Conflicts* (London: Bloomsbury, 1998), i–xxxi; Raymond Aron, *The Century of Total War* (Boston: Beacon, 1965); Richard Ned Lebow, *Nuclear Crisis Management: A Dangerous Illusion* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987); Michael Klare, *Rogue States and Nuclear Outlaws: America's Search for a New Foreign Policy* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1995).

¹³⁴Kershaw, *Nemesis*, 518; Norman Rich, *Hitler's War Aims*, 2 vols. (New York: Norton, 1973), 2:3–9; Alexander, *How Hitler Could Have Won World War II*; Gerhard Weinberg, *Germany, Hitler, and World War II: Essays in Modern German History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 23–53.

Mutual understanding between groups in the face of the existence of international war has bedeviled world civilization for thousands of years. The idea of peace through intercultural communication continues to elude us, even in the age of sophisticated social science. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, irrespective of technical virtuosity, the inability of leaders and indeed entire national populations to comprehend what is most obvious and scripted in their collective actions remains an enduring problem for human survival. The very clearest example of this continues to be in the fall of 1962, when the United States and the Soviet Union appeared as close to nuclear Armageddon as they would ever be. The question of war or war avoidance rested on the ability of the parties to recognize the danger they were in. The epistemology of the Cold War and the nature of the Cold War's script had to accommodate the crisis by preventing a nuclear exchange between the superpowers.¹³⁵

The Technocratic Script

The experience of the Western metascript in the twentieth century has combined diametrically opposed emotions. On the one hand, the nuclear revolution and subsequent nuclear crises spread a mixture of trauma and fear of Armageddon. On the other hand, however, the simultaneous ubiquitous developments of the technocratic age—including progress in every aspect of technological society, from medicine to global satellite imaging and telecommunications—produced a measured confidence in the inevitability of a utopian age. The technocratic script worked at many levels. At the institutional level it generated hundreds or perhaps thousands of compartmentalized knowledge systems. In turn, these systems not only filled the intellectual consciousness of the age, but produced the technologies that have transformed modern history. Machinelike, universities, government research laboratories, and corporate facilities have created in the last half of the twentieth century a brilliant protean scientific and technological civilization. The intellectual heritage of the Enlightenment presaged a controlled world in which scientific knowledge would eventually solve all human needs. Rationality, an elusive quest of modern history since the Renaissance, was embodied in the intellectual disciplines of the physical, life, and social sciences, which sought systematic planning and control over so many aspects of human experience.¹³⁶

¹³⁵Bruce G. Blair, *The Logic of Accidental Nuclear War* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1993); Robert Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 74–106, 136–73; McGeorge Bundy, *Danger and Survival* (New York: Random House, 1988); Ronald E. Powaski, *March to Armageddon: The United States and the Nuclear Arms Race, 1939 to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987) and *Return to Armageddon: The United States and the Nuclear Arms Race, 1981–1999* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1–38, 251–58; Herman Kahn, *On Thermonuclear War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960).

¹³⁶Karl Popper, *The Myth of the Framework: In Defence of Science and Rationality* (London: Routledge, 1994); Gianni Vaghi, *The Economics of Francois Quesnay* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1987); Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *The Origins of Physiocracy: Economic Revolution*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

However, on the level of the nation-state, the metascript did not end war or tyranny. The Nazis and the Stalinists and other totalitarian groups also subscribed to the idea of a scientific-industrial civilization as a new utopia. Even when the most heinous of totalitarian states were removed from the face of the earth, the metascript still left a world riddled with political and military conflict, from the Middle East and the Indian subcontinent to the Balkans and the Caucasus. Clearly, the promise of a digital civilization in the twenty-first century remains the quintessence of the technocratic metascript, in which the problems of humankind will be solved by the perfection of the technocratic.¹³⁷

Yet, the paradox of the metascript remains the contrast between its epistemological framework and its political context. In the last decades of the last century and the first years of the new one, the movement toward a global secular humanistic technocratic civilization was belied by the political conundrums of a fragile and deeply variegated international system. In a world dominated by international and internecine conflicts, with political divisions along ethnic, religious, ideological, and economic lines, the power of the techno and the logos of the United States and the West seemed almost beside the point. With ever-greater modernizing elements in the world, the overall crises of modernization facing the world's peripheries remained unabated. How, it was asked, could the power of the advanced nation-states solve the severe inequities that the expansion of European society had created around the world? The problems faced by generations of leaders in the West, and, in particular, in the United States, were almost entirely political, even if the structure governing the scripts and metascripts was related to deeper, more fundamental problems facing the world's peoples.¹³⁸

For the United States, the script turned in response to events in the metascript. Recurring crises during the Cold War shaped a national consciousness toward all foreign policy crises. Year after year, the public was subjected to crises related to the geostrategic

and Social Order in Eighteenth-Century France (*Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976*); Keith Michael Baker, Condorcet: From Natural Philosophy to Social Mathematics (*Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975*); W. G. Runciman, Applied Social Theory (*New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997*).

¹³⁷Roco and Bainbridge, Societal Implications of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology; Edward A. Rietman, Molecular Engineering of Nanosystems (*New York: Springer, 2001*); Cristian S. Calude and Gheorghe Paun, Computing with Cells and Atoms: An Introduction to Quantum, DNA, and Membrane Computing (*New York: Taylor & Francis, 2001*); Julian Brown, Minds, Machines, and the Multiverse: The Quest for the Quantum Computer (*New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000*); Williams Clearwater, Ultimate Zero and One: Computing at the Quantum Frontier (*New York: Copernicus, 2000*); Michael A. Nielsen and Isaak L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (*New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000*); U.S. House Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Basic Research (Hearings), Beyond Silicon-based Computing: Quantum and Molecular Computing 106, no. 2 (September 12, 2000) (*Washington, DC: GPO, 2001*).

¹³⁸Jomo and Nagaraj, Globalization versus Development; Jeffrey James, Technology, Globalization and Poverty (*Northampton, MA: Elgar, 2002*); Walden Bello, Dark Victory: The United States and Global Poverty (*London: Pluto Press, 1999*).

and ideological rivalry with the Soviet Union. There were coups and revolutions in every corner of the world, many of which were connected to American and/or Soviet covert operations. The Greek Civil War of 1945–1947 was a crisis, as was the Berlin blockade a year later. The Chinese Revolution of 1949, the explosion of the Soviet Union's first atomic bomb, and finally the outbreak of the Korean War were all deep, script-turning foreign policy crises. The CIA-backed Iranian and Guatemalan coups and the fall of French Indochina were some of the crises that governed the Eisenhower and Truman administrations in the first part of the 1950s. The latter part of that decade involved the Suez, Hungarian, Taiwan, Laotian, and Berlin crises, and then the Cuban Revolution quickly became a crisis. Crisis management became an almost continuous exercise of foreign policy in the United States government. The training of diplomats and national security analysts became oriented toward dealing with short-term crises that exposed the national security system to a range of dangers, both strategic and political.¹³⁹

So the professional orientation of the technocratic state to the foreign policy crisis was the milieu that framed the national command authority's decisions relating to the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. In that crisis, along with the near accidental nuclear war of 1983, the world was brought closer to physical annihilation than at any other time in the nuclear age. The response, which has been studied for decades, was scripted by the narratives of orthodox Cold War decision makers with tense paranoid views of potential appeasement of an enemy of absolute ruthlessness. Yet, the huddled terror that revolved around the White House and the Kremlin seventeen years after the Second World War was both real and ritualistic. It was real in that the catastrophic consequences would have been real if the confrontation had resulted in war, and ritualistic in its crisis protocols and the predictable views of its participants.

"Predictable" is an unkind word for the most compelling of crises, but we must in historical terms view all crises as scripted moments. Just as two dominant males in a herd of large animals will engage in ritualized combat, locking horns and thrashing one another in a test of power, the same theatrical displays are found among human beings. In the confrontation between the American and Russian navies off the coast of Cuba, the prospect of locking not horns but weapons systems demonstrated the evolutionary durability of patriarchal power.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹For foreign policy crises, the memoirs of American secretaries of state are the most instructive. See Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department* (New York: Norton, 1969); Kissinger, *White House Years and Years of Upheaval* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1982); Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Advisor, 1977–1981* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1983); James A. Baker III, *The Politics of Diplomacy: Revolution, War, and Peace, 1989–1992* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1995).

¹⁴⁰James G. Blight, *The Shattered Crystal Ball: Fear and Learning in the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1991), 3–10, 25–52; Weisbrot, *Maximum Danger*, 111–48; Lawrence Freedman, *Kennedy's Wars: Berlin, Cuba, Laos and Vietnam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 190–202.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

War was averted—barely, but averted all the same. The deciding factors were in the scripts of the leaders who played their roles as agents of national, group, and individual scripts with enough aplomb to have survived the encounter. Kennedy would die only a year later, and Khrushchev would be deposed only a year after that, but the two men defused the crisis through the script posed by Wilsonian internationalism applied to the 1960s. Concessions were made, and with them the entire national security regimes of the two states responded with institutional protocols that returned Armageddon to the back of the nuclear world's stage. In the Cuban Missile Crisis, unlike many other Cold War confrontations, the gravity of the experience changed not only Kennedy and Khrushchev but also the entire corps of foreign policy elite that “managed” the bipolar system. The political component of the script turned in the fall of 1962, as it had in earlier crises and would again in later ones. The orthodox Cold War, which will be discussed in detail in this monograph, passed over several years into a postorthodox or revisionist period of the “middle” Cold War. This would be the age of Vietnam.¹⁴¹

America the Redeemer

Scripts drive human behavior in consistent, repetitive patterns. Irrespective of the degree of self-awareness imparted to the actor, the script will move forward following its destiny. This has been true of individuals involved in decision making in all areas and at all levels of politics. In fact, patterns of life development, good and bad, have generally held true for all individuals, whether common or uncommon in life circumstance. Historical cycles of victory, tragedy, growth, decay, destruction, and renewal have been accurate, repetitive dimensions in the histories of groups and institutions at all levels of historical significance. Finally, the same dynamics that exist, singularly and collectively, in people and organizations are also operative at the highest levels of social integration, namely, in the behavior of nation-states and civilizations. The nation-state, an invention of modern history, remains beholden to the scripted path of its cultural system and collective identity.¹⁴²

The American script is familiar to Americans and foreigners alike. Both explicitly and intuitively, the concept of American nationality suggests a millenary quest for what the national Constitution and Declaration of Independence gave as America's birthright. The script is a schema for collective action found allegorically in endless forms in American literature, music, film, and media. Entirely faithful to its national history, the redeemer nation discovered the twentieth century to be fertile ground for fulfillment of its self-defined national purpose. The imprimatur of liberal Calvinist doctrine combined with the technocratic to make a twentieth-century superpower. The script armed the country with

¹⁴¹Glenn T. Seaborg, *Kennedy, Khrushchev and the Test Ban* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981); Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 204–10; David Halberstam, *The Best and the Brightest* (New York: Random House, 1972).

¹⁴²Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 17–21, 487–91; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1991), 5–7, 83–111.

the technological means that seventeenth-century societies never thought possible. Yet, the concept of American fulfillment remained as it was. Americans, whether in the first settlements on the Atlantic, or in the founding period, or on the Mormon treks of the nineteenth century, or in the patriotic sentiments of soldiers during the Mexican War, the Civil War, and the War with Spain, all had sought to build the enduring metaphor for American civilization: a new Zion. Even with the rapid development of secular knowledge and institutions in American society, the quest for Zion carried through the twentieth century. Despite the scientific discourse that belied Christian and ethnocentric concepts of national purpose, the script had not changed at all. Corporate and national interests in global security shaped the architecture of the liberal technocratic order and the “new” American script.¹⁴³

The newness, however, was superficial. As an international actor in the twentieth century, the United States, through its collective personality and the actions of its leaders, continued to strive toward the imaginary synthesis of a redemptive liberal order. This was accepted and propagandized even when the country’s actions militated against it. Was the nation’s redemption in the support of scores of right-wing authoritarian regimes on every continent? The country viewed liberalization, democracy, and Westernization as the highest achievements it could attain in foreign affairs. Yet, the covert actions of the CIA were often quite inconsistent with the country’s neo-Wilsonian ideology. There was no call to the higher ideals of American internationalism, other than in Cold War rhetoric, when the U.S. Army trained thousands of Latin American soldiers and police in the methods of terror. This was done without interruption throughout the length of the Cold War, on American soil by uniformed military trainers, all in the name of America’s sanctimonious war for “freedom.”¹⁴⁴

Other examples that militated against the ideology of progressive internationalism were shown in the hypocritical human rights policies of numerous administrations. In the public’s eyes, this was most especially true of the Reagan administration during the 1980s. The narrative propaganda for American greatness and against the threat of international communism inspired a generation of Cold War acolytes and believers. That collective script for anticommunism did not lose its grip until the Vietnam experience shattered the integrity of the establishment and the military. Then the script turned, and orthodoxy was overthrown. Yet, it was reborn as a dominant mode of the national script during the 1980s, when the Reaganite ideology returned orthodoxy to the fold of the righteous. In practice, a range of Cold War scripts influenced the actions of Americans not informed by the common American script of Cold War liberalism and anticommunism.

¹⁴³Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*, 209–64; *Leffler*, *Preponderance of Power*, 499–511; *Cummings*, *Parallax Visions*, 205–26.

¹⁴⁴*Michael McClintock*, *Instruments of Statecraft: U.S. Guerrilla Warfare, Counterinsurgency, and Counter-terrorism, 1940–1990* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), 389–448; *Robert Armstrong and Janet Shenk*, *El Salvador: The Face of Revolution* (London: Pluto Press, 1982), 159–232; *Raymond Bonner*, *Weakness and Deceit: U.S. Policy and El Salvador* (New York: Times Books, 1984).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

On the right, nationalist scripts were represented by the promilitary ideologies of Barry Goldwater and Curtis LeMay, and on the far right, Robert Welch and Joseph McCarthy. On the American left, pacifist and antimilitary scripts of socialists and peace activists engendered resistance to the core ideology of the Washington foreign policy establishment. In the final analysis, however, the national script for internationalism fell into a relatively narrow range. Even conservative presidents abided by the ideas of the preservation and expansion of democratic capitalism. Finally, even the most left-wing leadership of the Democratic Party subscribed to anticommunism.¹⁴⁵

All human drama must deal with the richness of a particular context. Characters in a play must always respond appropriately to their milieu. They must react with sensitivity to the mood and the context of the particular scene. So it was with Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt during the First World War. A global war empowered both men to act on their most strongly held views of America's position in the world. Their respective ideologies mirrored the national dichotomy between a strongly defined modern nationalism and an equally strong modern internationalism. Wilson was the "high priest" of liberal internationalist thought; he pontificated to audiences worldwide his vision of international peace founded upon collective security, free trade, and national self-determination. Roosevelt, in contrast, was the "warrior." He followed the conservative internationalism of American nationalists. Consistent with his behavior as secretary of the navy, as president he subscribed to the geostrategic and naval realism that annexed the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines and turned the entire Caribbean into an American protectorate.¹⁴⁶

What each statesman presented to the public was an ideology for international relations. Their respective visions were consistent with two distinct American scripts. In turn, each script was followed by particular group coalitions within the national polity. Wilson was not a pacifist but a believer in the primacy of negotiation and international law. Roosevelt favored military preparedness and the use of force over the uncertainties of diplomacy. Diplomatic and military ideologies were two poles that attracted different groups within the American state. Wilson's genteel internationalism was favored by a coalition of interests tied by cultural and economic links to Western Europe. Roosevelt, as a significant literature suggests, was tied more closely to American nationalists and believers in Mahanian strategic doctrine. The American script, or, more exactly,

¹⁴⁵Bonner, *Weakness and Deceit*, 230–369; E. Bradford Burns, *At War in Nicaragua: The Reagan Doctrine and the Politics of Nostalgia* (New York: Perennial Library, 1987); James M. Scott, *Deciding to Intervene: The Reagan Doctrine and American Foreign Policy* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996), 1–39, 152–92; Noam Chomsky, *The Culture of Terrorism* (Boston: South End Press, 1988).

¹⁴⁶John Milton Cooper Jr., *The Warrior and the Priest: Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 288–323; Knock, *To End All Wars*, 48–69; Kenneth Wimmel, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Great White Fleet: American Seapower Comes of Age* (Washington, DC: Brassey's, 1998); Bradley Gilman, *Roosevelt: The Happy Warrior* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1921), 133–62.

metascript, that presented itself to the world during the First World War was balanced between these two perspectives. The script that the country followed turned on the experience of the nation within the context of the First World War.¹⁴⁷

Underlying both Rooseveltian and Wilsonian ideologies, as well as the other perspectives on American foreign policy advocated by agrarian populists, socialists, peace activists, and others, was the concept of redemption. Redemption would be found in the approximation of an American ideal for itself and the world. The Wilsonian and Rooseveltian views of national redemption led the country to war in 1917.¹⁴⁸ Afterward, the redemptive mission drove the Wilsonian concept of postwar reconstruction in the Versailles peace plan. During the 1920s, the corporate internationalism of Republican presidents found salvation in the reinterpretation of Wilsonian internationalism and the expansion of American economic interests overseas. The Great Depression found the cousin of Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a Democrat and follower of Woodrow Wilson, focused upon saving the republic. Redemption in the early and mid-1930s was found in isolationism. The policy of appeasement, in the mid- and late 1930s, was found bankrupt. The script turned with Pearl Harbor. America converted itself, once again, into an expansionist redeemer. Once more, following the path of earlier wars, the Second World War mobilized not only the vast technocratic machine of American science and industry, but also the moral fiber of an avenging nation.¹⁴⁹

During the Cold War, the script turned again. Redemption was seen not in the defeat of fascism but in the destruction of international communism. The resources of the now richer, mightier, and more technocratic nation became scripted for global rivalry. Both American culture and state organized their existence during the early Cold War—the

¹⁴⁷See Richard D. Challener, *Admirals, Generals and American Foreign Policy, 1898–1914* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973), 30–32, 88; Howard Beale, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power* (1956; reprint, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984); William E. Livezey, *Mahan on Sea Power* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1981); Richard H. Collin, *Theodore Roosevelt: Culture, Diplomacy, and Expansion: A New View of American Imperialism* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985).

¹⁴⁸Knock, *To End All Wars*, 105–22. Frank Ninkovich distinguishes between “normal” and “crisis” internationalism. Wilsonian doctrine, which inspired America’s global role, was and remains, accordingly, a crisis form of international relations in which the liberal order must expand its power to protect itself. Ninkovich, *The Wilsonian Century*, 48–77; Theodore Roosevelt, *America and the World War* (New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, 1915), vii–xv; John A. Lester, ed., *The Americanism of Theodore Roosevelt: Selections from His Writings and Speeches* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1923).

¹⁴⁹Gordon Prange, *At Dawn We Slept: The Untold Story of Pearl Harbor* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981), 582–84; Holly Cowan Schulman, *The Voice of America: Propaganda and Democracy, 1941–1945* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995). Steven Casey has demonstrated the complexity of American public opinion, including the lingering reluctance of formerly isolationist groups to expand the war to Europe as well as Asia in the early years of the Second World War. See Steven Casey, *Cautious Crusade: Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Public Opinion, and the War against Nazi Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 46–79; John W. Dower, *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

“orthodox” period, as I have termed it—around the global containment and elimination of communism. In this pursuit, the national script built an institutional and epistemological universe of enormous sophistication and complexity. By the “middle” Cold War (the age of Vietnam), American Cold War culture involved a huge university system dedicated, along with the business system and the military, to the global technocratic projects of space exploration, modernization and multinational capitalism, counterinsurgency warfare, conventional warfare, and the nuclear arms race.¹⁵⁰

In Vietnam, the script turned once more. The war stripped the state and the orthodox Cold War culture of its legitimacy. Social change on a large scale changed the country’s culture. The 1960s and 1970s were marked, in the United States and in other parts of the West, by social, sexual, and intellectual revolution. The redeemer nation found its denouement during the Vietnam War. The national script fell into interminable crisis as the country experienced the political divisions of the war and the race riots of the 1960s. In a genuine sense, the country had gone through a “modernization crisis,” using a term invented by Americans to understand the Third World. The epistemology of the Cold War fractured on the political rocks of the Tet offensive of 1968 and the Kent State massacre of 1970. The orthodox social sciences and humanities melted, albeit not entirely, in the sun of the Woodstock festival of 1969 and in the ghetto riots of Newark, Watts, and Detroit.¹⁵¹

Despite the crisis, the new Cold War culture was more diverse and more flexible, if also far less stable. The conflict’s impressive effects on American culture left an opening for the end of the Cold War during the 1980s, when the confluence of American and Russian scripts finally led to the conflict’s end. Before that happened, the Vietnam War ended, the energy crisis of the 1970s began, and the Afghan and Iranian crises, at the end of the decade, led to the election of Ronald Reagan. With Reagan, the script turned, challenging the Keynesian liberal technocratic consensus with a more unilateralist vision of American foreign relations. The national security state, its prestige damaged and funding hollowed, was restored to its former orthodox status. The Pentagon underwent something of a renaissance in the 1980s; defense spending doubled, and expansive programs were initiated to conquer near space with a new generation of lasers and advanced computers. Popular culture reexamined the revisionist period and the concept of the market gained nearly iconic status.¹⁵²

Then the Cold War ended in 1989–1990, and the script turned once more. The redeemer nation had been reborn in the early 1980s. It revived the legitimacy of nuclear

¹⁵⁰Simpson, *Universities and Empire*; *Cummings*, *Parallax Visions*, 173–204.

¹⁵¹Julie Stevens, *Anti-disciplinary Protest: Sixties Radicalism and Postmodernism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 10–46, 96–199; Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960’s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Novick, *That Noble Dream*, 281–319.

¹⁵²Milton Friedman, *Free to Choose: A Personal Statement* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980); Thomas Sowell, *Markets and Minorities* (New York: Basic Books, 1981); Alexander M. Haig Jr., *Caveat: Realism, Reagan and Foreign Policy* (New York: Macmillan, 1984).

physics and the CIA and won the Cold War with information-age capitalism and military science. This was the status quo at the end of the Cold War and the beginning of the first decade of the post–Cold War era, when the United States spread its power and culture deeply around the globe. Its legitimacy as a nation-state and society of world historical importance had never been greater. Yet, the redeemer lacked the political will to achieve all that was expected of it. It failed to rescue much of the world from the deep political, economic, and social crises of the turn of the century. The country prospered enormously, with its technocratic civilization poised to achieve spectacular progress, but its redemptive mission to the world appeared wanting, ironically, when it seemed most able to accomplish it. In the wake of the first decade of the post–Cold War era, had the script turned again?¹⁵³

Conclusion

In the first decade of the new century and millennium, the script had turned for the redeemer nation. The nation remained conflicted, coping with the enormity of technological change and the imposing challenges presented to both national and world culture. On a global scale, the same issues between peoples were operative. It was not clear how quickly or neatly the political divisions caused by resource scarcity would be solved. Still to be negotiated was the huge disparity between core and periphery, between the affluent (and extremely rich) and the mass of humanity that lived on a tiny fraction, per capita, of the world's aggregate wealth. For the United States, permanent world peace appeared within reach, but the dangers caused by political crisis in the underdeveloped world threatened an indeterminate amount of future harm. The safety of billions of people and the survival of the planet's ecosystems appeared to be at risk, if only because there was no global consensus on how to manage disparate human societies and a fragile biosphere designed brilliantly to support the species that dominated it.¹⁵⁴

American policy remained perplexed by countervailing demands. Nationalists required instrumental actions to sustain American supremacy as a nation-state. Simultaneously, internationalists needed a strategic plan to sustain the institutional structures that maintained the international system under American sponsorship. Redemption touched both nationalists and internationalists. It required nationalists to protect the prestige of the United States in an environment that remained hostile to any nationalist objectives by a superpower. Further, redemption using internationalism presented policy makers with the complex and often formidable tasks of achieving global cooperation within the context of

¹⁵³Here the events of September 11 come into play. See Center for Terrorism Research, <http://www.terrorism.com/homelandattack.shtml>; Center for International Policy, "September 11 Information and Analysis," <http://www.ciponline.org/NationalSecurity/911.htm>.

¹⁵⁴Joseph Wayne Smith, Graham Lyons, and Gary Sauer-Thompson, *The Bankruptcy of Economics: Ecology, Economics and the Sustainability of the Earth* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999); H. J. Schellnhuber and V. Wenzel, eds., *Earth System Analysis: Integrating Science for Sustainability* (New York: Springer, 1998); OECD, *Sustainable Development: Critical Issues* (Paris: OECD, 2001).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

nationalist constituencies around the world and in the United States. Redemption in internationalist terms meant the victory of international organization and the neo-Wilsonian agenda for peace. In this quest, all victories appeared to be necessarily ephemeral.¹⁵⁵

Yet, Americans, born to achieve redemption, supported the driving ambitions for American society. The world would be inundated with American goods and Americanism. The nation's values would continue, through public and private undertakings, to be exported to human communities around the world. The new century beckoned with prospects for awe-inspiring progress and opportunity, and the possibility of ending tyranny on earth. The twentieth century had beckoned the same way, and so had the nineteenth and the eighteenth. It was the possibility of achieving the vision of utopia, the chance for salvation through actions in the material world, that sent Americans forward in the first years of the twenty-first century. The same had also been true in 1914, as the newly technocratic nation first faced the world.

¹⁵⁵Stephen F. Cohen, *Failed Crusade: America and the Tragedy of Post-Communist Russia* (New York: Norton, 2000); Robert S. Litwak, *Rogue States and U.S. Foreign Policy: Containment after the Cold War* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2000), 47–118; Jacquelyn K. Davis, *Strategic Paradigms 2025: U.S. Security Planning for a New Era* (London: Brassey's, 1999), 285–333; Klare, *Rogue States and Nuclear Outlaws*.

Chapter II

The Great War

Scripted Dimensions

The “guns of August,” as the title of Barbara Tuchman’s famous book suggests, did not just happen in the summer of 1914. They were set in the dimensions of a new age in European and world history. Despite the regencies of kings and emperors, ultimately, what was modern and scientific ruled in the legitimacy of the new era. Military force, national prestige, and public opinion were all contained in the global struggle for power, influence, and aggrandizement. However, as almost everyone alive knew, it was the technocratic ethos that would determine the future shape of national power and the course of humankind.

The technocratic age began sometime early in the twentieth century. By “technocratic,” I mean the mature organization of industrial societies. In the cosmopolitan centers of Europe and North America, science and industrialism, instruments of the new period, merged into a new civilization oriented toward the perfection of machines and machine culture. For the production systems and administration of centralized industry and government, there was a need for the large-scale use of statistical information. Technocratic knowledge, in the form of specialized quantitative disciplines in business, economics, engineering, and physical and natural science, was demanded by the new muscular control required of a managed world. Technocratic culture—formal, mathematical, and analytical in every respect—showed itself in the period’s architecture, business systems, and feats of industrial and military engineering.¹⁵⁶ The new age was evident in the speed and power of physical technology

¹⁵⁶Ross, *Origins of American Social Science*, 172–256; Porter, *The Rise of Statistical Thinking*; Merritt Roe Smith, ed., *Military Enterprise and Technological Change: Perspectives on the American Experience* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985), 1–37; David C. Mowery and Nathan

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

and in the new robust intellectual technologies of the social and physical sciences. It was an age of extraordinary change mandated by the exponential development of new technology itself. Global civilization had developed rapidly during the nineteenth century. Now in the twentieth, the pace of innovation would, naturally, only accelerate.

In terms of world power, the most immediate and salient aspect of the technocratic age was the ongoing revolution in military technology. In the twentieth century, the older empires that depended upon large armies of foot soldiers and cavalry were now to be rendered quite obsolete. By the early 1900s, powerful dreadnoughts made of thousands of tons of steel and scientifically designed to the specifications of naval architects were the definition of national power. All the great naval powers were building huge steel warships for the coming war. Technocracy was evident in the industrial planning systems of the advanced industrial states as they built not only battleships but railroads, steel mills, and chemical plants. At the leading edge of technology, the leading countries built airplanes and installed new advanced communication systems, such as wireless radio, for military and commercial uses.¹⁵⁷

Predictably, the acceleration of technological change and its consequences on social and economic order left the old national establishments under profound stress. The speed and power of the new technologies challenged the sedate order of settled agrarian cultures. Collectively, the modern ethos of the new urban industrial cultures helped to unleash the virulent nationalism that spawned the Great War and destroyed the aristocracies that so dominated political power and the cultural ambience of prewar Europe. Expressing itself in both the creative and destructive forces of modernization, the technocratic ethos also unbound the complex social and political forces that would lead to postwar fascism and communism. The new global epoch not only promised the growth of a global civilization, full of prosperity and universal democracy, but its more sinister aspects would accomplish the opposite. It would threaten the stability and even the survival of the liberal technocratic order just as it emerged as a coherent entity after the First World War.¹⁵⁸

The scientific and technological structures of the technocratic century emerged quickly and globally. The intellectual foundations of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Western science were essential to this new industrialized world. In the first years of the twentieth century, they created this new civilization based on chemical and electrical energy and

Rosenberg, Paths of Innovation: Technological Change in 20th Century America (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

¹⁵⁷*Roger Chickering and Stig Förster, eds., Great War, Total War: Combat and Mobilization on the Western Front, 1914–1918 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); David Stevenson, Armaments and the Coming War in Europe, 1904–1914 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); David G. Hermann, The Arming of Europe and the Making of the First World War (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).*

¹⁵⁸*Eric Hobsbawm, The Age of Empire, 1875–1914 (New York: Vintage, 1987), 262–338; Tuchman, The Guns of August; Norman Davies, Europe: A History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 759–896.*

mathematically based human knowledge. Western scientific thought expressed the technocratic ethos, not only in the physical sciences and industrial organization, but also in social science, law, and medicine. The legacies of the physiocrats, positivists, and inventors such as Darwin, Pasteur, Babbage, Faraday, Maxwell, Edison, Marx, Weber, and others found their way into the industrialized and industrializing world. The new scientific systems of thought shaped the organizations of commerce and the state. Inexorably, the institutions of modern nations, corporate and government, became more quantitative in nature. Driven by technocratic knowledge, organizations of all kinds were determined to be more rational, “scientific,” and statistical. The industries of finance, communications, and transportation systems, as well as military technology, became harbingers of this new world in which complex standardized knowledge disciplines extended their domination. The old society coexisted with it, but the path to the future, defined as “progress” and “modernity,” pointed to the steel and electronic visages of a new hyper-technological age. Unfortunately, it was a world that also developed the conflict systems of the European powers. The great power rivalries of the technocratic age would create the scripts necessary for a global military conflict. In this context, the fury of the Great War started.¹⁵⁹

Like all international conflicts, the war involved the working out of scripts. In each of the combatant states, the crisis evoked images, fears, and emotions all contained in national myths and collective memories. The major actors in the drama, the members of the Central Powers and the Triple Entente, responded in the summer of 1914 to a series of triggered events, reflexively and automatically pulling themselves into a cycle of escalation that exploded. Each actor could not help but continue the reaction-response movement of political, diplomatic, and finally military actions. Each actor—France, Germany, Russia, Serbia, Austria-Hungary, and Great Britain, to name the most salient—behaved within the context of imperial and nationalist scripts. Each nation reacted, subconsciously and consciously, based upon generations and centuries of ancestral memories. When the German army executed Von Moltke’s modification of the Schlieffen plan, it was not the year 1914 in their minds but earlier, in 1870 or 1866 or 1809 or earlier still, for the French and Germans had many wars between them. It was the same for the British, whose naval warfare traced back to the sixteenth century. It was the collective memory of nations, the shared emotions of imagined communities that exist in the cultural space of past wars, disasters, and victories that went to war once more in the

¹⁵⁹Bernard Delmas, Thierry Demals, and Philippe Steiner, eds., *La diffusion internationale de la physioocratie: XVIIIe-XIXe: actes du Colloque international de Saint Cloud (Grenoble, France: Presses universitaires de Grenoble, 1995)*. R. J. Turgot, R. L. Meek, trans., *Turgot on Progress, Sociology and Economics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973); Peter Allan Dale, *In Pursuit of a Scientific Culture: Science, Art, and Society in the Victorian Age* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989); Judith A. Merkle, *Management and Ideology: The Legacy of the International Scientific Management Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980); Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*; Stephen C. Chiabotti, ed., *Tooling for War: Military Transformation in the Industrial Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

summer of 1914. This penchant for war and the redemption of violence would come again, and then yet again in the twentieth century, even as the new ideas of the Wilsonian century took root.¹⁶⁰

How quickly the world war came. Nationalism and imperialism and the organizational doctrines of war had circulated in European cultures and politics for decades. Then the Western script triggered a war that seized Europe in the summer of 1914, and in less than five years, with the help of massive firepower engendered by technocratic means, blasted away much of the old order. A political assassination in a remote Balkan capital, in a province of the aged Austro-Hungarian Empire, triggered a familiar script. Deep patriotic emotions swelled around the capital cities and then, like clockwork, powerful interlocking alliances came to life throughout Europe. After decades of war preparation, gigantic armies, equipped with the newest of deadly artillery, capable of hurling hundred- and even thousand-pound steel projectiles across the expanse of a military line of defense, confronted one another on two sides of German-speaking Europe. The proud armies of empires and nation-states assembled on the west in northern France, and on the east along the Russian-Polish frontier. In a matter of months, horrific casualties, numbering in the many hundreds of thousands, filled cemeteries and hospitals all over Europe.¹⁶¹

Shared narratives of nation-states attached to their own mythopoeic concepts of nationhood plunged the continent into total war. Kaiser Wilhelm professed national self-defense:

*The sword has been forced into our hands. I hope that in the event that my efforts to the very last moment do not succeed in bringing our opponents to reason and in preserving peace, we may use the sword, with the help of God, so that we may sheathe it again with honor.*¹⁶²

The French response to the German assault through Belgium was even more vociferous in its enthusiasm and self-righteous ardor. President Poincaré addressed the French Parliament on August 4, 1914, to sounds of raucous cheers:

¹⁶⁰Tuchman, *The Guns of August*; Annika Mombauer, *Helmut Von Moltke and the Origins of the First World War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Martin Gilbert, *The First World War: A Complete History* (New York: Holt, 1996), 1–54; Hew Strachan, *The First World War, vol. 1, To Arms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 162–207.

¹⁶¹German and French casualties at the First Battle of the Marne have been estimated at 500,000; the battle lasted four days. See <http://info.ox.ac.uk/departments/humanities/rose/battle.html#mar>; Gilbert, *The First World War*, 55–77.

¹⁶²Kaiser Wilhelm's War Speeches, *Speech from the Balcony of the Royal Palace, Berlin, July 31, 1914*, *The World War I Document Archive*, www.lib.byu.edu/~rdh/wwi/1914/willy_talk.html.

*In the war which is beginning, France will have Right on her side, the eternal power of which cannot with impunity be disregarded by nations any more than by individuals (loud and unanimous applause). She will be heroically defended by all her sons; nothing will break their sacred union before the enemy; today they are joined together as brothers in a common indignation against the aggressor, and in a common patriotic faith.*¹⁶³

War enthusiasm gripped national publics in all the capitals of the major combatant states. A secondary literature on the subject discusses the psychological and sociological dimensions of the First World War as it began. Another literature examines the war's comparative domestic cultural and political dimensions, showing the depth of societal commitments as well as sufferings and, finally, the expansion of antiwar sentiment through the destruction and exhaustion of the conflict. The military dimensions of the conflict have been examined by an even more massive secondary literature in a number of languages, demonstrating how the conflict became a brutal campaign of land and sea war. Finally, its termination and settlement amid the destruction of European society established the preconditions for fascism, communism, and the Second World War a generation hence.¹⁶⁴

The war began in Europe, a product of interlocking strategic alliances and global rivalries for power and national prestige. With no territorial or strategic claim to the massive land war in Europe, the American role was, at the beginning, naturally tangential. By virtue of the nation's traditions and self-definition, the American role in Europe and in European imperial rivalries was to practice abiding neutrality. Despite the Spanish War, which projected American power across the Pacific, the country was not quite a global empire. America in 1914 did not define its interests in global terms as Great Britain, France, and Germany did. The American script was global in its projection of economic power: American commerce and finance established the United States as the world's preeminent economic power. Despite its strategic isolationism, the country led the world in industrial output and technology. In addition to financial assets, American natural resources and its vast and productive agricultural system were critical to the war effort of the Triple Entente. Nonetheless, U.S. industrial power and its large population of able-bodied males still did not automatically establish America as a true world power. To establish leadership in world affairs required a redefinition of America's role, a psychological development that had to wait until after the first three years of the Great War.

¹⁶³President Poincaré's War Message, *Address to Parliament (From the French Yellow Book Journal Officiel, Paris, August 5, 1914)*, the *World War I Document Archive*, www.lib.byu.edu/~rdh/wwi/1914/poincare.html.

¹⁶⁴Verhey, *The Spirit of 1914*; Jay Winter and Jean-Louis Robert, eds., *Capital Cities at War: 1914–1919* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

American neutrality vis-à-vis a European war was Washingtonian, dating to the first decade of American independence. There were strong elements of pro-war American nationalism present in the ideology of Theodore Roosevelt and the Republican Party. Roosevelt and other nationalists saw German power as a potential strategic threat of the highest order. Nonetheless, the strength of pro-war sentiment had to wait months and finally two and a half years before the general call to arms. At the war's beginning, no attempts were made to move the United States into the conflict.¹⁶⁵ The literature on American intervention juxtaposes elements of American nationalism and internationalism responding to an environment of global war. Americans viewed the Great War as they would other wars in the twentieth century, through the prisms of divergent foreign policy perspectives connected to particular group interests.

At the center of American decision-making, forms of military realism and progressive liberalism informed the thinking of opponents and proponents of the Wilson administration's ambiguous approach to nonintervention. The official American response to the outbreak of war was to declare neutrality. The United States, having no ambitions other than to protect the Western Hemisphere, would not transform itself into an international power with strategic and material interests in Europe. Nevertheless, the form of neutrality chosen by the United States clearly favored the Allies. As the war commenced, a steady stream of military and nonmilitary goods, as well as the financial assistance of American capital, supported the Triple Entente.¹⁶⁶ Still, irrespective of the Wilson administration's desires to support the containment of German power, the political interests of the nation and the Democratic Party militated against joining the war. To join voluntarily in a deadly land and sea war was, by common sense, not in the national interest.¹⁶⁷

The script for American neutrality was underlaid by the internal politics of ethnic divisions and passions. Internal group political scripts directly affected the electoral process. Ethnoculturally, British America supported Great Britain. For both cultural and economic reasons, the descendants of British immigrants, including those in the South and New England, and especially the patrician families on the eastern seaboard, were committed to supporting their transatlantic cousins against the Germans and Austrians. Conversely, the members of the very sizable immigrant population from German-speaking Europe favored their kinsmen. Some five hundred German newspapers and innumerable cultural institutions rallied behind the fatherland in its hour of crisis. Many other non-British ethnic groups, each driven by the historical patterns of its particular national script, supported neutrality rather than war. Irish, Scandinavian, and Jewish populations were for their own particular reasons hostile to the Triple Entente. Irish

¹⁶⁵Knock, *To End All Wars*, 34.

¹⁶⁶Paul A. C. Koistinen, *Mobilizing for Modern War: The Political Economy of American Warfare, 1865–1919* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997), 166–267.

¹⁶⁷Knock, *To End All Wars*, 31–69; Patrick Devlin, *Too Proud to Fight: Woodrow Wilson's Neutrality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975); Arthur Link, *Wilson: Campaigns for Progressivism and Peace* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965), 5:38–42.

Americans would not support the colonial occupier of Eire; they saw no virtue in the defense of the British Empire. Further, the sizable and insular populations of Scandinavian Americans and Ashkenazi Jews had their own reasons for opposing a military alliance with the Allies. Scandinavians were generally pacifist and were close to the Germans in cultural terms. American Jews viewed Russia as an enemy, an anti-Semitic country, while Germany was a friend.¹⁶⁸

America, as a nation that opened itself up to large-scale immigration, by the second decade of the twentieth century possessed a very different character from the nationalism that defined the nation-state in most of Europe. The civic nature of American nationality allowed the peopling of many different groups within the United States. Yet, the fusion of these groups into the American “melting pot” had not eliminated the ethnic ties of immigrants and their children and grandchildren. President Wilson said as much in his message to Congress, recognizing that “the people of the United States were drawn from many nations, particularly the nations now at war.”¹⁶⁹

Over several years, the internal dialogue between those groups who favored a strategic approach to the war and those who subscribed to neutrality and a diplomatic solution represented a fundamental cleavage within the American polity. As the war began in Europe, the political script given to the United States was traditional and unambiguous. Despite more sympathy for the Allies, the national government had to consider its self-concept at the beginning of a new century. It was divided not only by ethnicity, but also by sectional interests, race, religion, and class, and ideologically by perceived notions of international relations and the nature of America’s role in the world.¹⁷⁰ Prior to 1914, at the height of the progressive era, the political left had been strong in America. The aversion to war was a clarion call to the progressive internationalism of the socialists, labor unions, and others who condemned capitalism and European militarism as moral evils.

Wilson and his administration were astute enough to understand these issues implicitly, and they discussed them openly. The national script for neutrality evolved very quickly into a policy of nonintervention that favored the Allies. Quite soon the Wilson administration and other institutions, including leading newspapers, wavered in a state of partial neutrality. The country would not contribute to the Allied cause directly with soldiers or material aid. However, the private sector supplied the British and French with all they needed in food and arms, and large New York banks eagerly financed the huge purchases of war materials. Nonetheless, the neutrality was genuine in the sense that not one American soldier was sent to Europe, nor was a single warship engaged against the formidable German submarine fleet. Only after the repeated sinking of American

¹⁶⁸Carl Frederick Witke, *German-Americans and the World War* (Columbus: Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society, 1936); Devlin, *Too Proud to Fight*, 141; Link, *Wilson*, 5:13–14.

¹⁶⁹Woodrow Wilson, *Message to Congress*, 63rd Cong., 2d sess., *Senate Doc. No. 566* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1914), 3–4.

¹⁷⁰Knock, *To End All Wars*, 53–69.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

ships in international waters and the failure of all diplomatic efforts was the decision made for war. The first American forces did not depart for France until late spring 1917. Even then, the first genuine military contribution of American combat troops had to wait another year. Full American participation in the Great War did not begin until late spring 1918. Then, a desperate situation on the Western front was reversed by the sudden arrival of hundreds of thousands of American troops. Finally, the redeeming nation came through.¹⁷¹

Consistent with all matters of foreign affairs in its national history, the redeemer nation orchestrated realism with passion. American action responded to both domestic and international pressures, transforming Wilson's consistent policy of avoiding war at all costs to one that required victory. In 1914, the major actors in Europe and in the international sphere saw America as a peripheral power.¹⁷² In the wake of the massive engagements in the first months of the war, American participation and influence were a nonissue. Although the United States was the world's leading economic power, its military might was negligible. With an army more deserving of a country a tenth its size, and a navy that too had failed to achieve great power status, the United States was unprepared—militarily or, more importantly, politically and culturally—for participation in the Great War. The American script subscribed to national greatness, but it also militated against the projection of American power into Europe. Throughout the period of American expansionism and including the war with Spain, American influence moved south in the Americas and west into the Pacific. However, in keeping with George Washington's advice of 1796, the country avoided European involvement at all costs. Doing so in a Eurocentric world had significant consequences. On the world stage, the paradox between America's economic and military roles in the international system placed the country's influence somewhere between that of a great power and a middling one.¹⁷³

In the domestic sphere as well as in the international, the national script for the Great War centered itself around the issue of neutrality and the national debate over it. Despite

¹⁷¹Devlin, *Too Proud to Fight*, 637–681; Link, *Wilson*, 5:390–429; *Center of Military History, United States Army in the World War, 1917–1919*, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army, 1989).

¹⁷²Russell F. Weigley, "Strategy and Total War in the United States: Pershing and the American Military Tradition," in Chickering and Förster, *Great War, Total War*, 327–48; John Patarick Finnegan, *Against the Specter of a Dragon: The Campaign for American Military Preparedness, 1914–1917* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973), 5–21.

¹⁷³General Pershing's insecurity vis-à-vis Europe had everything to do with America's self-defined marginality as a strategic force prior to the First World War. In European eyes, the United States did not have an army in the modern sense:

Militarily, the U.S. Army had usually counted for even less in terms of world power than its dependence on European models and instruction alone might have implied. Through most of its history it had been less an army in the sense of serving as an instrument of its country's foreign policy than an internal constabulary, policing the frontier between white and black settlements on the one hand and the North American Indians on the other. (Weigley, "Pershing and the American Military Tradition," in *Great War, Total War*, 330)

Americans' inherent belief in the ability of their country to overcome its enemies, the panoply of interest group lobbies and the political alignments that surrounded the decision-making process in Washington demanded a cautious script. Even after several years of ever more difficult neutrality, it finally took the provocation of unrestricted German submarine warfare to push Wilson and his political allies to declare war. The American narrative, at the turn of the script in Europe, was to observe but not to enter. Only after years of indecision and, finally, the challenge of German sea power to dominate the Atlantic, did the American and Wilsonian scripts turn. With German troops threatening to overrun Russia and Paris, and with the prospect of a world thoroughly dominated by authoritarian movements, whether German fascism or the radical socialism that was sweeping through much of Europe, Wilson weighed his options and carefully chose war. Sitting at his desk late at night at the end of March 1917, he wrote and then typed his declaration of war that he submitted to Congress on April 6, 1917. He summed up his reasons for going to war against Germany. German militarism was a permanent threat to American aspirations for democracy:

*We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic governments of the world.*¹⁷⁴

By democracy, Wilson meant societies that were governed by constitutions and the rule of law. Americans viewed the German state as so brutal and autocratic that it would never respect the liberal culture that defined American nationality. For Wilson, Christianity and American democracy were indistinguishable. Clearly, the Christian mission for the country was to protect its ideals and spread them to a world in need. Each of the nations engaged in the conflict understood its national identity as a people close to God. For the United States, prior to the Great War, national redemption was not found in its participation in international affairs, or in a concept of global mission that required the projection of American institutions around the surface of the earth. Significantly, Americans always understood their revolution as a unique event in world history and believed that popular democracy as found in America was worthy of emulation by nations on every continent. Yet, the country, as of the beginning of the First World War, did not define its goals with respect to a preponderant role in international peace and order. To reiterate, even after the war with Spain and the acquisition of overseas territories, the prevailing view of America by both Americans and Europeans was its regionalism. The United States was a country that defended its continent and its hemisphere, but would not and did not seek a global presence. Rather than sustaining the

¹⁷⁴Woodrow Wilson, *War Messages*, 65th Cong., 1st sess., Senate Doc. No. 5, Serial No. 7264 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1917), 3–8.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

empires of Britain and France, the United States was more concerned with resolution of its domestic progressive-era conflicts and struggles.

In 1914, as millions of Europeans mobilized across battlefields, and scores of warships held the sea lanes, the traditional Washingtonian principle of nonintervention in European affairs held. Wilson had no mandate to side with the Allies, nor did he want one. Regardless of Woodrow Wilson's penchant for internationalism (shared by some academic and political groups), as an organized polity the country saw its narrative in the growth and development of the American nation-state. The pursuit of the domestic reforms of the progressive era, including fair labor practices and women's suffrage, and the continued growth of the American economy, were of greater importance than the fate of Europe in the hands of competing empires.¹⁷⁵

The script turned with events in Europe. The Central Powers defeated the Russians and threatened Britain and France with bankruptcy and subjugation. The movement of the Germans toward victory in Europe and global hegemony mobilized the new American narrative. When the script finally turned with Wilson's declaration of war in April 1917, the nation embarked upon a path of accelerated development as a global power. From that day forward, the country undertook a path of internationalism that would create and expand the liberal technocratic order over ensuing decades of war and peace. The United States would support the new order, even as it faltered through the many and sordid crises of the twentieth century. The institutions and knowledge systems that sustained the machinelike warfare of the conflict expanded during and after the First World War. The technocratic or prototechnocratic forms of war and diplomacy established a permanent American presence in world affairs. In the context of decades and generations, the impetus for innovation provided by the Great War stimulated building, not only new generations of armaments, but also new concepts for every aspect of human design and consciousness of the physical world. In this war of industrial-scale destruction and technological advances in military engineering, the world powers mobilized nearly all their resources to wage total war. The modality of total war was an essential legacy of the Great War, not only for the United States but also for all the other actors involved.¹⁷⁶

The European Script: Nationalism and Technocracy

Since this war was for Europe, it was therefore quite logically a conflict for control of Europe's global hegemony. The interests of the warring parties were as great as those confronting the participants in the religious wars of the Counter-Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, or the Napoleonic wars of the early nineteenth century. In every respect, the conflict of the Great War was utterly sweeping in its consequences. On all the great powers, and indeed on all the peoples of Europe and

¹⁷⁵Cooper, *The Warrior and the Priest*, 206–21; Woodrow Wilson, *The New Freedom: A Call for the Emancipation of the Generous Energies of a People* (New York: Doubleday, 1913).

¹⁷⁶Dennis Showalter, "Mass Warfare and the Impact of Technology," in Chickering and Förster, *Great War, Total War*, 73–93.

within the European empires, the First World War, like its successor twenty years later, had profound strategic, political, economic, cultural, and psychological impacts. Not only was the liberal technocratic order founded in its aftermath, but the seeds of National Socialism and the Russian Revolution were also sown in the desolate areas of the war's front lines. As German and French soldiers waged a desperate fight at the first battle of the Marne, an entire new period of world history lay before them. In the bleakness and tragedy of the first truly industrial war, the technocratic age appeared.¹⁷⁷

European nationalism and technocracy, two narratives of essential weight in history, combined with each other in the Great War. As noted, the nationalist and the technocratic undermined the political foundations of the old agrarian and aristocratic order. The technocratic script, since its acceleration in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, had always promised deep and permanent social, economic, and political change. In the first decades of a new age and a new century, the old empires, secure in their historicist high cultures, had to come to terms with the new reality. They needed to adapt to the vast and complex processes of industrialization. Indeed, this was a burden to political systems based upon the inherited rights of nobility and royalty, including tenure over large agricultural estates, unfettered patriarchy, and elitism. Authoritarian and deeply stratified, the script for the old European orders would not take to the technocratic modernity born of the scientific, political, and social thought of the second industrial revolution.¹⁷⁸ In summary,, the epistemologies of the twentieth century would not sustain premodern institutions founded in the vestigial practices of parts of Europe. Ideologies dedicated to change, namely, capitalism, socialism, and liberalism, and the mechanical, chemical, and electrical technologies of the second age of industrialism, militated against the semifeudal traditions of the European empires.¹⁷⁹

The material effects of the scientific and industrial revolutions were evident in every area and aspect of contemporary society. As noted, the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries effected the development of an extraordinary production, transportation, and communication revolution in the physical systems that governed mass society. There were large, newly efficient steel mills, transcontinental railroad systems, global telegraphy, telephony, radio signals, the first airplanes, and in the United States, mass-produced motorized transport. Scientific knowledge in all areas of the academy advanced rapidly. In Europe and North America, the physical, natural, and social sciences were

¹⁷⁷Jacynth Hope-Simpson, *The Making of the Machine Age* (London: Heineman, 1978); Gilman Ostrander, *American Civilization in the First Machine Age, 1890–1940* (New York: Harper, 1970); Charles A. Beard and William Beard, *American Leviathan: The Republic in the Machine Age* (New York: MacMillan, 1930).

¹⁷⁸Barbara Tuchman, *The Proud Tower: A Portrait of the World before the War, 1890–1914* (New York: MacMillan, 1966); Barrington Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967).

¹⁷⁹Henry Friedlander, *The German Revolution of 1918* (New York: Garland, 1992); Abraham Ascher, *The Revolution of 1905* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988); Arthur May, *The Passing of the Hapsburg Monarchy, 1914–1918, 2 vols.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

being institutionalized. The work of university departments, professional associations, and scholarly periodicals produced new knowledge and inventions that changed the intellectual consciousness of the developed world at an astonishing rate. Some of the scholarship and research activities of these new institutions generated extraordinary and provocative theories of the human, physical, and natural worlds.

Modernity did not begin with the Great War; it only coincided with it. Decades before the first artillery guns fired at Mons and Tannenberg in August 1914, the transformation of modern consciousness had already begun. Over the previous half century the modern intellect had begun to emerge. *The Origin of Species*, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and *The Special Theory of Relativity*, by Charles Darwin, Sigmund Freud, and Albert Einstein, respectively, as well as the works of Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, and many others, had transmogrified scientific thought.¹⁸⁰ The physical universe was now conjectured to exist in four dimensions, not three, and its most solid form, matter, was thought to contain fantastic levels of energy, locked up in the most unimaginable of spaces—the atomic level.¹⁸¹ The biological universe was thought to be many thousands of times older than imagined, and the Darwinian theory of evolution rejected the biblical story of creation. Theories of the mind and of society challenged the very basis of social and political order and of human rationality. In sum, as the parade of military forces engaged at the battles of the Marne, the Somme, Verdun, and Gallipoli, the pretechnocratic old order faced its antithesis and nemesis in the new script. Modernism in Western art and science stood against the paternalist neoclassical culture of Europe's elites, and threatened not only to radically transform it, but to subsume its legacy to a new technocratic culture.¹⁸²

The Western metascript, juxtaposing feudal and aristocratic orders with the modern political economy of technocratic liberalism, had reached a new point of world historical importance. The leading edge of modernity, which incorporated secular scientific and commercial beliefs and practices, and was suffused with antitraditional, anti-imperialist sentiments, had profound political ramifications for the hereditary rights of czars, sultans,

¹⁸⁰Thomas F. Glick, ed., *The Comparative Reception of Relativity* (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1987); Arthur I. Miller, *Albert Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity: Emergence (1905) and Early Interpretation (1905–1911)* (New York: Springer, 1998); Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretations of Dreams*, 3rd ed. (New York: MacMillan, 1913); Martin Wain, *Freud's Answer to the Social Origins of Our Psychoanalytic Century* (Chicago: Ivan Dee, 1998); Michael Ruse, *The Darwinian Revolution: Science Red in Tooth and Claw*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); Asher Horowitz and Terry Maley, *The Barbarism of Reason: Max Weber and the Twilight of Enlightenment* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994).

¹⁸¹Einstein added the fourth dimension at the age of twenty-six during his "miracle year" of 1905; see David Bohm, *The Special Theory of Relativity* (New York: Routledge, 1996); John Stachel, ed., *Einstein's Miraculous Year: Five Papers That Changed the Face of Physics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998).

¹⁸²A culture defined by Marx, Freud, Einstein, Darwin et al. See Stephen Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880–1918* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983); Carl Boggs, *Intellectuals and the Crisis of Modernity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993).

emperors, and kings. The dominant script, namely, the scientific-industrial-technocratic narrative for national development, would soon leave the great European empires in a state of eclipse. All the imperial powers of Europe faced the emergence of nationalism among their colonial peoples. Whether in Europe or elsewhere, the empires of Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Russia, Turkey, and, informally, the United States, had to come to terms with the future structure of the international community. The imperialist ideologies that professed the superiority of Europeans were still prevalent as the empires clashed for control of Africa and Asia as well as Europe. Yet clearly, with the new consciousness among native elites, the domination of the world by monarchy and empire could not last.¹⁸³

In Europe itself, the aristocrats and educated classes confronted more immediate and threatening adversaries. The ruling classes had to face mass movements for democracy and social and economic equality fomented by socialists, communists, and liberal nationalists. To an intelligent observer, in every practical respect the beginning of the century had to be seen as a time of reckoning. After a century of fear and repression, agency for the working classes of the industrialized West had to be considered a fundamental right. The international system as a whole had to address inherent inequities based upon class, race, and ethnic group.¹⁸⁴ The imperial vision, encapsulated in Rudyard Kipling's phrase "the white man's burden," could not survive when Indians, Africans, Arabs, and East Asians demanded self-government and independence. Native elites in the colonial regions, receptive to the ideas of the French and American revolutions, could hardly accept as permanent the imperial hierarchy imposed by the colonial powers. Ultimately, these elites believed, political rights should not be based upon the racist categories of skin color, religion, and ethnicity. To progressive internationalists, including socialists, democratic liberals, and native anticolonial nationalists, the plantation-based colonial political economies would have to be overthrown or otherwise reformed deeply and permanently. In Europe, the suppression of smaller groups such as Serbs, Poles, Armenians, Jews, Irish, and others could not survive in a new era of globalism.¹⁸⁵ Even if the aristocrats and their loyal patronage systems in government and industry perpetuated the institutional frameworks of the old order, the new machine age beckoned in the technocratic epistemologies. It was clear that contemporary Western ideas and systems of knowledge did not respect international boundaries.

¹⁸³Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire*; John Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism, and the German Problem, 1865–1925* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Michael Adas, *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989); Strachan, *The First World War*, 695–814.

¹⁸⁴George Crowder, *Classical Anarchism: The Political Thought of Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Shlomo Barer, *The Doctors of Revolution: 19th-Century Thinkers Who Changed the World* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2000).

¹⁸⁵Jane Addams, *The Overthrow of the War System* (Boston: Massachusetts Women's Peace Party, 1916); Beisner, *Twelve against Empire*.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

To informed observers it came as no surprise, then, when the national scripts of a dozen European nations came together violently in the summer of 1914. The crisis ushered in seventy-five years of warfare and strategic rivalry for the control of Europe and with it the entire international system. The narrative of European history, driven by the expansionist ideologies of liberalism and nationalism and the institutional machines of the industrial age, created a new scale of technocratic warfare whose result was massive destruction and tragedy. Inevitably, the intertwined scripts of nationalism and science-based industrialism promised a conflict of horrendous power. Within weeks of its start, huge industrial-based armies inflicted a telling Clausewitzian war on the continent. The machinery of war, institutional and epistemological, had been built over generations. The best engineering applied to military science from the Napoleonic period onward designed the steel-based weapons systems that crushed young men to bits. The giant and rapid-fire guns of the opposing armies and navies, industrial products of ballistic engineering, chemistry, metallurgy, and factory design, inflicted the unparalleled damage of the First World War.¹⁸⁶

Despite the imminent dangers of such destruction, the governments of the nation-states involved summoned the mass mobilization of their citizens. The millions called up were inspired by the singular ideologies of nationalism. Convinced of their blood ties to the “nation,” mainly young men went to war. They went to die for Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, Turkey, and the other combatants. When the United States entered the conflict, the same was true. In the First World War, and through successor conflicts in the twentieth century, technocratic institutions and intellectual constructs intertwined with raw human passions attached to the ideas of God and country.¹⁸⁷

As the war took its toll, with more than a million casualties at the battle of the Somme alone, public support for the war ebbed among all the combatant countries. Protest movements began in Great Britain and Russia, threatening the public will to continue the war. Unrest was evident even under the authoritarian regime of Wilhelm’s Germany. Yet, the war could not end. The stakes were far too high for either side to acquiesce to the other. Despite the loss of life and the trauma and suffering, including malnutrition and psychiatric casualties, the struggle for world power remained paramount. As both popular accounts and the historiography of the war assert, the North Atlantic became a graveyard for merchant ships, and the trench lines across France were the burial grounds for a generation of European males. It was clear that the war would not end until the last

¹⁸⁶ John Terraine, *White Heat: The New Warfare, 1914–1918* (London: Sidgwick & Johnson, 1982); Guy Hartcup, *The War of Invention: Scientific Developments, 1914–1918* (Washington, DC: Brassey’s, 1988); Hubert Johnson, *Breakthrough! Tactics, Technology, and the Search for Victory on the Western Front in World War I* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1994), 87–112.

¹⁸⁷ David M. Kennedy, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980); M. L. Sanders and Philip M. Taylor, *British Propaganda during the First World War, 1914–1918* (London: Macmillan, 1982); Stephen Vaughn, *Holding Fast the Inner Lines: Democracy, Nationalism, and the Committee on Public Information* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 116–40; Jahn, *Patriotic Culture in Russia during World War I*.

manpower reserves on the losing side were exhausted or when the loss of territory and essential war materials was so great that there no longer existed the physical ability to maintain normal military operations.¹⁸⁸

Nationalism and Imperialism

For socialist thinkers such as Rosa Luxemburg, Leon Trotsky, and Vladimir Lenin, the First World War was a logical result of the internationalization of capitalism and empirical proof of the validity of Marxist theory of class struggle.¹⁸⁹ Horrifying in its effects, the war created the essential conditions for the destruction of imperialism and the creation of a higher order of socioeconomic development. Indeed, the massive domestic destabilizing effects of the war, including near starvation and economic ruin, were the essential basis for the socialist revolutions in Russia, Germany, Austria, and Hungary.¹⁹⁰

The unlocking of class warfare in Europe provided the ideological basis for several generations of struggle between the forces of liberalism, fascism, and Marxism-Leninism. Without question, the scripts that unfolded in the wake of the Great War produced the social bases for both fascism and communism as mass movements in Europe. The conflict was fully instrumental in the rise of fascism, including its most virulent form, National Socialism. In Russia, of course, the destruction of the Russian army allowed the victory of Lenin and the Bolshevik movement and the establishment of the Soviet Union.¹⁹¹ Ultimately, the entire history of the twentieth century from the end of the Great War to the year 2000 was framed by this reordering of the international system. From the First World War emerged liberal internationalism, or what I have called the liberal technocratic order. In this epistemology for international political economy, there was now a coherent concept of global development based upon the scientific and industrial knowledge systems of the West. Complementary to its founding of the modern political order, the technocratic script for the Great War provided the structural conditions for the scientific and technological innovations that were changing the world. The world was changing everything: its knowledge and institutions, its military and industrial systems, and its overall political economy. With its immense capital resources and industrial capacity, the American economy would form the center of the international system in the 1920s. Corporate internationalism and the growth of scientific enterprises in the United

¹⁸⁸Losses totaled 5,600 killed for every day of the war. In addition, 750,000 Germans alone died from the famine induced by the British blockade (Gilbert, *The First World War*, 541).

¹⁸⁹Stephen Eric Bronner, *Letters of Rosa Luxembourg* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1979); V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism: A Popular Outline* (New York: International Publishers, 1933) and *The State and Revolution* (New York: Vanguard, 1929); Leon Trotsky, *The Bolsheviks and World Peace* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1918).

¹⁹⁰Davies, *Europe*, 928–38; A. J. Ryder, *The German Revolution of 1918: A Study of German Socialism in War and Revolt* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 140–217.

¹⁹¹Kershaw, *Hubris*, 73–105; Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Knopf, 1990); Roger Griffin, ed., *Fascism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

States would balance the relative decline of the European colonial powers and the rival systems that emerged in the Soviet Union and later in Germany and Japan.¹⁹²

The global script for war undertaken in 1914 was more than just technocratic. Whatever the level of domination by rationalist ideology, human culture has never been antiseptic to the point of divorce from emotions and collective memories. The script has never relinquished its material attachments to the living environment of land and sea. What made the twentieth century so dangerous was precisely the merging of the technocratic with ancestral hatreds. The technocratic scripting of the First World War combined science and industrialism with the historical animosities of competing nationalist foes. The fateful narrative connected cycles of revenge and injury that had existed since the Middle Ages. At its deepest level, the first industrial war involved the acting out of centuries of European conflict between rival nation-states and ethnic groups. In the estimate of realist-oriented historians and political scientists, the First World War was like all others—a struggle for power. The origins of the war have been understood in the literature in terms of nationalism and imperialism.¹⁹³ The European empires, aligned against one another in the complex matrix of history and strategic rivalries, went to war to settle the terms of relationship within the European regional system. The irrepressible forces of atavistic nationalism, conditioned over many centuries, combined with the institutionalized conflict over the division of markets, resources, and prestige between the great European powers. The result was a brutal campaign of industrial-age warfare. Massive armies, equipped with the most deadly munitions and weapons systems, the “white heat” of twentieth-century combat, demolished each other with deadly speed. The conflict was merciless, and perhaps in the final analysis pointless, but it continued anyway. Despite incalculable losses, both material and psychological, the war was propelled forward by the scripts embedded so deeply in the combatants’ respective cultural identities.¹⁹⁴

Nationalist scripts, reflected in language and culture, imbued large and often heterogeneous populations with narrative and images for a collective history and destiny. Throughout the nineteenth century, nationalist ideologies served as critical agents for mass mobilization, thereby shaping the political formation of nation-states. All of these nationalist ideologies shared a belief in the exceptionalism of their nations.¹⁹⁵ British,

¹⁹²Ross, *Origins of American Social Science*, 390–470; Warren Cohen, *Empire without Tears: American Foreign Relations, 1921–1933* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987); Ethan Ellis, *Republican Foreign Policy, 1921–1933* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1968); Michael J. Hogan, *Informal Entente: The Private Structure of Cooperation in Anglo-American Diplomacy, 1918–1928* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1977); Rosenberg, *Financial Missionaries to the World*.

¹⁹³Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire*, 302–40; Strachan, *The First World War*, 1–102; Tuchman, *The Guns of August*.

¹⁹⁴Strachan, *The First World War*, 1114–40.

¹⁹⁵For a comparative history of nationalism, see Greenfeld, *Nationalism*. There is some controversy in the very large literature on nationalism over whether it is a cultural or an institutional form. Some scholars see nationalism as a very recent phenomenon in European and

French, Russian, Spanish, German, American, and Italian nationalisms, not to mention the nationalisms of smaller European and non-European societies, demonstrated the same forms of mythological ethnocentrism. The “chosen people” were not only the Hebrews but also the Poles, Irish, French, and Germans, as well as the Chinese and Japanese and Vietnamese and Korean peoples.¹⁹⁶

The nationalist script was essentially an extension or expansion of earlier forms of cultural identity based upon tribal or group membership. What made nationalist identity so dangerous was, of course, its historical codetermination with the technological forces of industrialism. When the military machines of nation-states became capable of launching attacks of utter destructiveness, as happened in the fall of 1914, they became monstrously dysfunctional. The depth of group-centered identity, commonly built upon shared interests in economic and territorial control, became far too lethal when mass-produced weapons systems made armies capable of absolute annihilation. So, when the British laid siege to the north German coast in 1914, and the Germans in response launched unrestricted submarine warfare against Britain, a new level of warfare had been reached. Starvation, or at least severe malnutrition, threatened Germany, while severe loss of life from submarine attacks, as well as severe food shortages, threatened Great Britain. The machine guns and field artillery pieces planted in the fields of northern France and in military theaters around Europe slaughtered millions of young men on the front lines. Other new destructive weapons systems added to the carnage. These included chemical weapons, tanks, and aircraft, all invented and developed by young scientists and engineers dedicated to their nationalist creeds. From the destruction of men by men, there would be no respite.¹⁹⁷

The events of the summer of 1914 that led to war were capable of lighting the powder keg of alliance systems precisely because the nationalist scripts, the ideologies that shaped popular perceptions and emotions, were so powerful in national cultures. The dramaturgy of war was extraordinary, imparting patriotic fervor throughout warring Europe. The crowds that marched and danced in Berlin and Vienna and in Paris, London,

world history, dating to the nineteenth century. Greenfeld dates the idea of the modern nation as beginning in sixteenth-century England. Other scholars, in particular medieval historians, see nationalism as much more ancient. See Adrian Hastings, The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

¹⁹⁶*These were some of the groups represented at the Versailles Conference. For nationalism, see Greenfeld, Nationalism; Anderson, Imagined Communities; Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures; Eric Hobsbawm, Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth and Reality (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., Nationalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).*

¹⁹⁷*L. F. Haber, The Poisonous Cloud: Chemical Warfare in the First World War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); David Zabecki, Steel Wind: Colonel Georg Bruchmuller and the Birth of Modern Artillery (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994); Chiabotti, Tooling for War; Edwyn Gray, The U-Boat War, 1914–1918 (London: Leo Cooper, 1994).*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

and St. Petersburg celebrated the mythologies of their national creeds.¹⁹⁸ Each of those crowds was an agent of popular sentiments. Each was representative of the militaristic passions that collectively launched the First World War. Political rallies, whether organized or unrehearsed, were spectacular forms of theater, reiterating the themes that carried the public will to make profound sacrifices for the sake of the nation.¹⁹⁹ The dramaturgy of war was written into the rhetoric and salutations of nationalist meetings. Fiery leaders, editorial writers, and other professional propagandists mobilized mass societies for the extraordinary privations that this conflict would inflict on soldiers and civilians alike. In nationalism, the political leaderships of modern nation-states have a durable script, an organizing principle for political, economic, and social order, critical for war as well as peace. The use of nationalism has been so efficacious for leaderships of all kinds and its presence has been so ubiquitous in modern history that its constitutive nature has often been overlooked.²⁰⁰

The modern nation was born sometime in the sixteenth century, when English culture embraced the new concept of “nation”—a term that had just entered the language. Historically, a nation was a family or clan referenced by a particular geographic location. However, the beginning of modern history, with the expansion of trade and the consolidation of ethnic communities under one permanent sovereign and territory, expanded the concept of nation to mean something greater than what was within immediate eyesight. The new concept was abstract and historical. The nation-state was born in the British Isles, and over the course of two centuries the concept spread to the rest of Europe and the European spheres of acculturation in what is now called the Third World. By the nineteenth century, the nationalist spirit or script was active among ethnic groups throughout Europe and indeed the world. The “nation” was universal by the late

¹⁹⁸Verhey, *The Spirit of 1914*; Hans Rogger, “Russia in 1914,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 1, no. 196:95–119; Josh Sanborn, “The Mobilization of 1914 and the Question of the Russian Nation: A Reexamination,” *Slavic Review* 59 (2000): 267–89.

¹⁹⁹Geertz, *Negara*, 98–120; Verhey, *The Spirit of 1914*, 7–10; C. E. Montague, *Disenchantment* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978), 13.

²⁰⁰Verhey’s thesis considers the role of German institutions in the creation of the social myth of German patriotism in 1914. German elites, principally intellectuals and politicians, manipulated this myth of the purposes of war mobilization during the First World War and beyond. The same argument can be made for the other combatant nations in which the memory of war was connected to the nationalist script. At the level of the nation-state, scripts have certain “payoffs” for those who control them. Clearly, in American history the “myth” of American patriotism was the basis for the powerful isolationist critiques of the interwar period, including the Nye committee of 1935, which implicated American business interests, the so-called Merchants of Death, in the U.S. entry into the war. See Matthew Ware Coulter, *The Senate Munitions Inquiry of the 1930s: Beyond the Merchants of Death* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997).

nineteenth century. Mass mobilization became a fearsome weapon for the early twentieth-century nationalist script.²⁰¹

The cement that allowed nation-states to wage total war was the nationalist script. It was an “organizational weapon,” analogous to Lenin’s concept of the communist party. Without the concrete material sentiment of the common soldier and citizen for the nation, the ability of armies to fight fiercely and the commitment of young men ready to die for their homeland would not have been possible. The nationalist creed later inspired fascism around the world during the decade of the 1930s; during the First World War, nationalism inspired unbending resistance on all sides. By the end of the conflict, the losses were so severe in every combatant country that the whole nature of the European state system, and, indeed, the state of the European colonial empires, was in doubt. Anti-imperial sentiments spread throughout the colonial world as socialist revolution threatened the basis for empire in Europe.²⁰²

As a strong form of nationalism, the imperial script inspired powerful displays of political theater. In both mother countries and colonies, elite circles extolled the virtues of their civilizations. Overseas empires extended the cultural domain of nations, empowering images of national supremacy and historical destiny. The French colonial elite came to view its African colonies as essential parts of France itself, just as overseas British saw every part of the global dominion as an extension of the realm. American imperialists were no different, extending the concept of Manifest Destiny to the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines. Japanese imperialism mirrored the behavior of the Europeans. The Empire of the Rising Sun had begun its expansion with the annexation of Taiwan and the Korean peninsula after its war with China in the last decade of the nineteenth century. The First World War would add a few German islands, but during the two decades after the war, the Japanese “East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere” would become a concept of overriding national mission.²⁰³ The imperial script, dominant, self-validating, and impervious to domestic and foreign critiques, was at the very center of the

²⁰¹On the power of nationalism as an agent in military mobilization there are many sources. For World War I, see Tuchman, *The Guns of August*; Verhey, *The Spirit of 1914*; Kennedy, *Over Here*, 45–92, 144–90.

²⁰²For the decline of European empire related to nationalism, see Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*, 131–62. *Fascism was born from nationalism*. See Zeev Sternhell, *The Birth of Fascist Ideology: From Cultural Rebellion to Political Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994). Sternhell makes the distinction between fascism and National Socialism, suggesting that one cannot conflate the two movements. Barrington Moore, however, in *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, connects the World War II ideologies of the Axis powers under the rubric of fascism. To the extent that fascism was grounded in the trauma caused by the First World War to national societies, it is connected to the overriding concept of jingoistic nationalism prevalent in the first half of the twentieth century.

²⁰³The actual document for the Japanese design for empire is translated in Ryusaku Tsunoda, William Theodore De Bary, and Donald Keene, *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), 294–98. Akira Iriye, *Power and Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Western metascript in 1914. In 1918, with the war's end, the international system was reordered, but the imperial script survived. Driven by powerful undercurrents of national self-interest, it was somewhat altered, given the new terms for imperial control in the post-Versailles interwar period. However, the narrative of national exceptionalism projected outward, and it was far too close to human needs and frailties to merely disappear.

Viewed in terms of thousands of years of recorded history, European imperialism becomes less formidable. As a global phenomenon of sweeping power and influence, it was a very new and ultimately transient phenomenon in most parts of the world. It dominated the Americas from the sixteenth century onward, but it did not gain preponderant influence in Africa and Asia until the nineteenth. European imperialism consisted of idiosyncratic empires that, at their apogees, controlled most of the earth's surface outside of the Western Hemisphere.²⁰⁴ However, the age of European hegemony lasted no more than two centuries. To contemporary European observers, the imperial script was principally a self-evident desire for national greatness and for the genuine needs and interests of Europeans to civilize the rest of the world. To suggest otherwise, from their perspective, was absurd. Indeed, anti-imperialist sentiments existed among Europeans. Socialists, in particular, who understood imperialism as a form of capitalist tyranny, sympathized with the anti-imperial sentiments of colonial peoples. To most of the European public, however, the structure of imperial power in the world was unassailable. European imperialism was an extension of the power struggle between the leading nations of Europe for continental and global leadership. In Africa, British Africa competed with French, German, and Belgian Africa. There was British India, the "Jewel in the Crown" of the empire, as well as French Indochina and French Polynesia, and all the European powers prior to the 1930s had "interest sections" on Chinese soil. The world, for the shortest of times, from the mid-1800s to the mid-1900s, was focused on the division of its regions among the European nations who desired them.²⁰⁵

Understood in this context of global power, the scripted logic of the start of the First World War becomes very clear. When German troops mobilized on their frontiers to invade France through Belgium and to attack Russia in the east, the German goals were transparent. Plainly, the Schlieffen plan executed through Belgium was a bold attempt at the immediate encirclement and destruction of the French army. The defeat of France would have led to the quick dispatch of the Russian threat and would have achieved total

²⁰⁴Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire*; Philip D. Curtain, *The World and the West: The European Challenge and the Overseas Response in the Age of Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); David B. Abernathy, *The Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires, 1415–1980* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000).

²⁰⁵Michael Adas, ed., *Islamic and European Expansion: The Forging of a Global Order* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993); Adas, *Machines as the Measure of Men*; Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993).

victory for the Reich against its enemies.²⁰⁶ With the destruction of French and then Russian power, Germany would have become the preeminent power not only on the European continent, but, arguably, in the world. Winning the war for the continent would have allowed the German imperial script to fulfill its long-held objective, the domination of continental Europe. Comparable in size but industrially superior to Great Britain, the German nation wanted to dominate much of Africa and Asia. In the event of success, German achievements, economic and political and strategic, would bask in the glory of validating the German script for national greatness. Finally, the Germans would repudiate with revenge the rival scripts of their adversaries, which envisioned similar scenarios for national greatness.²⁰⁷

Almost by definition, all imperial systems included intricate structures for economic and political control. Only through such pervasive control could a transnational authoritarian political system be effective. By necessity, all imperial scripts extended the institutions and culture of the mother country to the colonial states. Universally, the land and material and labor resources of the colonies were assets owned by the nation for its greater economic and strategic security, success, and prestige. In the context of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, national empires facilitated the development of the modern technocratic script: a new control system and political framework based upon a new concept of international and national development. The imperial script did not have a vision of an integrated cosmopolitan international system based upon political and economic equality. Supporting that vision militated against the very concept of imperialism. The British Empire could not see equality between Englishmen and Scotsmen and the nonwhite non-Europeans of the empire. The Indians of South Asia, or the Malay, Burmese, Chinese, Bantu, Caribbean, or Polynesian ethnic classes under British rule, could never expect equality of any kind from their mother country. The same was true for all the imperial systems of the early twentieth century. Each system had its corresponding script, ideology, and institutions, and the subjects were not only non-

²⁰⁶ Arden Bucholz, Moltke, Schlieffen, and Prussian War Planning (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 214–320; Basil H. Liddell Hart, *The Real War 1914–1918* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1964), 36–114; Jehuda Wallach, *The Dogma of the Battle of Annihilation: The Theories of Clausewitz and Schlieffen and Their Impact on the German Conduct of Two World Wars* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986), 109–14. Wallach casts doubt on the commonly accepted counterfactual claim that a proper execution of the Schlieffen plan would have ended the war with a German victory in 1914. *The Germans never had the resources to encircle and destroy the French forces.*

²⁰⁷ Strachan, *The First World War*, 694–814. *Strachan understands the German script as global and expansionist, which is consistent with the rubric for late-nineteenth-century European imperial ideology. The nature of German war aims remains a long-standing controversy in Great War historiography. In German historiography, Germany was in pursuit of an expansionist script for imperial domination; see Fritz Fischer, Germany's Aims in the First World War* (New York: Norton, 1967). Alternatively, see John Moses, *The Politics of Illusion: The Fischer Controversy in German Historiography* (London: Harper & Row, 1975).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Europeans but the dominated peoples of Europe as well, including the Serbs of Bosnia-Herzegovina.²⁰⁸

In the weeks and months that followed the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand in Sarajevo, the mechanisms of nationalist and imperial ideology suffused the thoughts and emotions of hundreds of millions of Europeans. In each country, the concept of the nation and the empire sent large armies into the field and navies onto the open sea to attack and destroy the enemy. As noted, the passions unleashed were often ferocious. Reports of horrendous atrocities in the Balkans, Belgium, northern France, and Turkish Armenia attested to the power of propaganda as well as to the genuine brutality and mercilessness of culturally defined hatreds. Adolf Hitler was but a lowly messenger on the Western front, yet his passion for the fatherland was typical of that of millions of common soldiers. For true nationalists, the commitment to win the war at all costs was a categorical imperative. To most, victory became a question of national survival. So, the Great War was fought not only on the battlefields; it was also contested in the deep cognitive and emotional architecture that defines cultural scripts.²⁰⁹

In the final analysis, however, the First World War was more than a demonstration of dangerous and destructive nationalism. It was significant beyond its brutality as a modern war of efficient means. The conflict was part of a new framework for international power that expanded on the traditional balance of forces that had defined European diplomacy since the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia.²¹⁰ The new age required an examination of the new epistemologies for twentieth-century internationalism. New ideas and new institutions were responsible for the reconstruction of the European state system in ways that had been thought impossible just a few years before. The war passed from 1914 to 1915 and beyond, and even after the armistice—even after 1945—the conflict did not end entirely. The destructive rivalries born of centuries of cyclical repetitions of war would not end simply because Europe and the international system had changed. The animus between nations and individuals could not be silenced with the advance of a neo-Kantian cosmopolitan order. As the century ended, the technocratic and the nationalist scripts had not resolved themselves in the Balkans and on the other margins of Europe. Nonetheless, the First World War and its successor conflicts provided an empirical framework for the

²⁰⁸Adas, *Machines as the Measures of Men*; Said, *Culture and Imperialism*; David Cannadine, *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 121–34; Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998).

²⁰⁹Kershaw, Hitler, 91–97; Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory*; Modris Eksteins, *Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age* (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1989).

²¹⁰Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, 143–255; Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 218–65; Stephen Van Evera, *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999).

technocratic practice of conflict resolution. Viewed as a continuous whole, the Great War and its four-generation aftermath have made the world incomparably different.²¹¹

Wilsonianism: The American Script

Woodrow Wilson came to the presidency at the age of fifty-six, after spending much of his adulthood as a political scientist, a college president, and finally a politician. The antecedents to his policies were his Southern liberal progressive script. It was a script that extolled reform Protestant Christianity, American nationality, and the corpus of progressive-era social science that had defined much of his adulthood. Wilson implicitly saw his country and hence himself as part of a mission to the world. The First World War summoned him, as he would have expected, to pursue a course that would embody the ideals that he had long held for American society. The question for Wilson, as with all of the American presidents, was how to articulate his own interests and ideology within the complex institutional apparatus of the nation-state. From the summer of 1914 to the spring of 1917, Woodrow Wilson worked mightily to avoid war. When he had no choice, he endorsed war on the same terms as his pro-war rivals. He fought a unilateral war with important allies, to secure victory for those allies. In material spoils, he pursued nothing for himself or his people. What he did pursue, but failed to achieve, was the postwar power to control the world for American security.

Precisely because of the diverse and heterogeneous nature of American society, American foreign policy always represented a complex mix of nationalist and internationalist sentiments. By the nature of the American political system, U.S. foreign relations had always been a Byzantine process. Nonetheless, it maintained a coherent end. In a society whose constitutional design was protective of minority rights, the nature of national policy required a great deal of national consensus. The script followed by such a complex institutional system ameliorated differences through compromise and consensus. This was true in an American culture that was based upon pluralism. Its complex, multilevel political process leveraged the political and economic power of various elites. Electorally, it possessed a very large and often fractious polity with allegiances to various distinct groups. During the twentieth century, the script that ruled the presidency and the foreign policy system was an ingenious system for manipulation. Its policies combined different elements of pacifism, isolationism, and jingoism, as well as various unilateral and multilateral approaches to world affairs. In contemporary world history, it was all quite typical of a procedural democracy subject to numerous influences.²¹²

²¹¹Davies, *Europe, 896–901*; Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, 256–413.

²¹²Thomas E. Cronin and Michael E. Genovese, *The Paradoxes of the American Presidency* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 66–131; James MacGregor Burns, *Presidential Government: The Crucible of Leadership* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973); Knock, *To End All Wars*; Arthur Link, *Wilson the Diplomatist: A Look at His Major Foreign Policies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957), 61–126.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Scholars of American diplomatic history have pointed to causes related to strategic, economic, ethnocultural, institutional, and other domestic political interests. Yet that heterogeneity, most commonly expressed in the opposition between the unilateralist and the internationalist concepts of America's response to world affairs, does not explain the continuity in its external relationships. This is because diverse pressures and interests coalesce in the nation's metascript. Instrumental responses to domestic constituencies have never overridden the fundamental trajectory of the American state. Isolationist sentiments, very strong before both world wars, did not prevent American intervention in 1917 and 1941. The Korean War was not halted by the domestic costs of yet another war, and Vietnam was not prevented by the fear of another Korea. The trauma of the Vietnam War, so destructive to all types of American institutions, did not diminish global containment policy. Finally, even the end of the Cold War did not change the essential systemic nature of American foreign policy objectives. So, in 1914 and later 1917, the American script, whose agent was Woodrow Wilson, incorporated elements of both internationalism and nationalism that were present in the nation's political culture.²¹³

The nationalist ideology in turn-of-the-century American foreign relations was a powerful tool for war. Its exemplar and leader was Theodore Roosevelt, who in so many speeches and essays extolled American nationality and the culture of "Americanism" as the strongest and most virtuous on earth. In Roosevelt's mind, and the minds of conservative nationalists everywhere in the country, American expansion to Alaska, Hawaii, and the Panama Canal was a strategic necessity. Indeed, Roosevelt's legacy was the projection of American power in the Caribbean and the Pacific. His strategic vision owed much to the navalism of Alfred T. Mahan, but Roosevelt himself determined his own views on national power and the necessity of projecting military force.²¹⁴ During the First World War, Roosevelt's National Security League lobbied the government for intervention on the side of the Triple Entente. As noted earlier, Roosevelt the "warrior" and Wilson the "priest," as termed by John Cooper, reflected the diametrically opposed but complementary roles of military and diplomatic approaches to international relations. Wilson's foreign policy emphasized the use of international law, but throughout his presidency he condoned the use of force where he thought it practical and necessary. The Great War tested his sophisticated ability to exercise military power.²¹⁵

Wilson's foreign policy was a synthesis of diplomacy and force. The nature of that synthesis was the managerial system of technocracy. Hence, the technocratic script that was essential to the operation of any modern state's foreign policy. The state, armed with the epistemological and institutional structures necessary for international war in the

²¹³See Akira Iriye, *The Globalization of America, 1913–1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 19–38; Ninkovich, *Modernity and Power*, 37–68.

²¹⁴A. T. Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power on History, 1660–1783* (London: Sampson Low, 1889); A. T. Mahan, *The Interest of America in Sea Power, Present and Future* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1897); A. T. Mahan, *Retrospect and Prospect: Studies in International Relations, Naval and Political* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1912).

²¹⁵Cooper, *The Warrior and the Priest*.

industrial age, used nationalism and internationalism to effect policy that, hopefully, triangulated domestic political interests, success on the battlefields, skies, and oceans, and success in the political dimensions of coalition warfare. Wilson moved gingerly between the political currents that surrounded his administration. He hoped to establish a truly fair and efficacious peace for the United States and the world. The president managed the state successfully through three years of neutrality and then through a year and a half of war. As history attests, he only failed—but, indeed, failed critically—in the period of war settlement.²¹⁶

Once more, let us review the American script. In 1914, the country was barely armed, but its potential for war was virtually unlimited. The script opposed American intervention in 1914 because the nature of the conflict, a struggle between ugly European empires, could not mobilize American public opinion. Nonetheless, the Wilson administration played a critical role, attempting to help its allies, Great Britain and France, against the authoritarian monarchy of the German Reich. At the beginning, American neutrality reflected a calculated political decision based upon the practical concerns of a nation thousands of miles away from the battlefields of Europe. American idealism, ever present in the beliefs of Woodrow Wilson and his first secretary of state, William Jennings Bryan, was oriented toward the liberation of mankind. Wilson and Bryan, as alluded to earlier, were not sympathetic to the support of empires fighting against other imperial states. Ultimately, a “balanced” neutrality gave way to a favored neutrality, and finally to intervention in defense of France and Great Britain. Drawn to the wall by the calculated strategy of the German high command to wage unrestricted submarine warfare, Wilson turned to the American public, which accepted, albeit reluctantly, his summons for American participation. The country could not tolerate the effrontery of the German challenge, and Wilson, his actions scripted by the circumstances, summoned the country to global power and leadership.²¹⁷

The Wilsonian script for war had to wait for the political moment. The moment came decisively in the spring of 1917. It came only after the Russian monarchy had fallen, when the path of the conflict looked as if the German army, freed from fighting a two-front war, would throw its awesome manpower and resources against the weakened French and British lines. Only after the aggressive German move to resume unrestricted submarine warfare, essentially offering unilateral notice that all ships in its war zone could be sunk without warning, did Wilson come to the firm conclusion that the country had to declare war and move against the Central Powers. The nature of the war required Wilson to stay out until no other path was allowable. Once the Germans had reached the

²¹⁶Knock, *To End All Wars*, 246–70; Ambrosius, Woodrow Wilson, 211–89.

²¹⁷Knock, *To End All Wars*, 116–22. Knock makes the point that no historian has adequate evidence to determine exactly why Wilson went to war, given his strong antiwar proclivities. Obviously, the immediate reasons had to do with German aggression. Knock does not surmise from this that Wilson then fought the war for the ultimate purpose of defeating Germany. Wilson’s concept of a postwar international system was anti-imperial, not just anti-German. See also Link, *Wilson: Campaigns for Progressivism and Peace*.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

point of total victory, the prospect of Germanization throughout Europe forced the next act in the script. Wilsonian neutrality, so roundly proclaimed in 1914 and 1915, was replaced with a formal declaration of war in 1917. Despite risks of enormous casualties, Wilson's vision required the defeat of the German empire and the rescue of the French and the British on the front lines facing the onslaught.²¹⁸

The country was demonstrably unprepared for a huge European land war. Still, Wilsonian America fought through the end of the conflict with tremendous vigor and determination. It was the first major war fought by the United States outside of its territorial boundaries, but it was, as Wilson had told the public in his declaration of war, a contest to control the destiny of the entire international system. The stakes were understood by the majority of the public, and elite opinion became enamored of the concept of an integrated world in which the favorable consequences of victory for American national security were palpable. Several million men out of a population of a little more than a hundred million were recruited for overseas combat. The American soldiers, seamen, and airmen who entered the armed forces in 1917 and 1918 were united in defense of the flag and the American ethos. War speeches were heard everywhere, exhorting young men to sign up and fight for Lady Liberty. Certainly, there had been significant dissent before April 1917. As discussed, socialists, the very large and influential German American community, and other groups had opposed intervention.

Yet, once war had been declared, powerful scripts took control over American behavior. The country, which was founded upon the creed of a limited state, began to build a prototype of the twentieth-century national security state. In the space of eighteen months a functional array of economic and political institutions organized American society for war. Tens of billions of dollars, previously an almost unimaginable sum, was spent on the physical assets, munitions, and weapons systems that a huge expeditionary force required. Both in its institutions and in popular culture, national war mobilization was complete. The country needed to prove itself as a world power. It needed to prove to Europeans, who watched as underarmed and lightly trained American divisions disembarked at French ports, that Americans had the stuff of European soldiers—that an American army could engage the German army and defeat it in battle. This too was part of the script for American culture and the metascript for the Great War. For the sake of its international prestige and self-concept, America needed to prove itself on the field of battle. It would win the war and acquire the international political capital that the other great powers, in the wake of defeat and huge losses, would be required to give up.²¹⁹

²¹⁸Knock, *To End All Wars*, 120.

²¹⁹For American war mobilization, see Kennedy, *Over Here*, 45–144; Robert Cuff, *The War Industries Board: Business-Government Relations during World War I* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); Grosvenor B. Clarkson, *Industrial America in the World War: The Strategy behind the Line, 1917–1918* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1923); Vaughn, *Holding Fast the Inner Lines*.

Strategy: Coalition Warfare

In a sense, American coalition warfare began in 1914. Wilson declared neutrality, but the United States supported the Allies with essential war goods and financing even as it maintained the formal policy of nonintervention. By the time war was declared in April 1917, the Allies were several billion dollars in debt to major American banking institutions, including, most prominently, the empire of J.P. Morgan. A huge commitment was made in the spring of 1917 to field a continental-sized American military force. However, with the country's army completely unprepared for the task, it was estimated that the major land force would not be ready until 1919. In addition to the desperate need for American finance, the British and French hoped only for the quick infusion of American troops to hold the line against the German army. Millions of American men were drafted or volunteered for the armed forces, which went to work on the mammoth task of training a major field army from scratch. Although the Allies wanted American troops, Wilson and his commander, General Pershing, were unwilling to give them to the Allies for use as cannon fodder. An American army had to be established in Europe to engage the enemy in coordination with the Anglo-French command.

Several million men were trained and ultimately sent overseas for combat. Naval, air, and army forces operating primarily in France supported the Allied line of defense against the German army in Belgium and northern France. Yet, the American army really only took part in the last offensive of the war on the Western front. The British, French, Belgians, Germans, and Austrians had fought grimly for three and a half years before the first major contingent of Americans arrived in the spring of 1918. However, it was not until September 1918 that General Pershing was ready to deploy a major American army. During the Meuse-Argonne offensive of September and November 1918, the American expeditionary force, numbering more than one million troops, attacked the German lines in the Argonne forest in coordination with British and French armies. In a final attempt to win the war, the Germans had launched five major offensives between March and September 1918 and had sustained a million casualties. After losing millions of soldiers in the previous years of the war, the German military machine was on its last legs, exhausted of manpower as it faced dozens of inexperienced but fresh American divisions. The American army sustained 40,000 casualties in the first four days of its offensive, in which it outnumbered the opposing German force by as much as eight to one. After forty-seven days of brutal assaults launched against machine guns and artillery, the American army had lost 120,000 dead and wounded, but its sacrifice had finally forced the German high command to sue for armistice.

In this early form of technocratic war, massive armies of foot soldiers remained an essential military resource. Technocratic war in northwest Europe in the second decade of the century remained in an early form, not far advanced from the field warfare of Napoleon or Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee. The Great War was technocratic in the sense that national institutions had coordinated a global organization of political, economic, and military resources and that the industrial systems used to manufacture and

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

transport the forces were technocratic organizations. The central aspect of coalition warfare involved massive deployments of troops and horses shielded by equally massive lines of field artillery over hundreds of kilometers of forests and meadows. The coordinated movements of large numbers of troops and the artillery barrages of thousands of guns proved themselves as harbingers of the new technocratic warfare. In the new war of machine-age attrition, the sheer quantity of force applied on the battlefield, combined with the sheer number troops mustered from civilian life, were compelling factors in victory. The material losses were huge enough to have a lasting impact on the French and British empires. The destruction of an entire generation of able-bodied young men would leave enormous scars on the ability of these nations to sustain themselves as global powers.²²⁰

With some irony, the technocratic war had created the mighty machinelike institutions that greatly increased the military power of the combatants. However, the psychological impact of the carnage would mitigate the strategic advances in weaponry, communications, transport, and tactics that the conflict produced. The technocratic script changed the consciousness of war in modern states. No longer, except in Hitler's Germany, and there only for a few years, was war seen as an ennobling experience. The liberal script, so sensitive to public opinion, turned against technocratic war even as its technological advances enhanced the coalition's management of the conflict. For more than eighteen months the United States, Great Britain, France, and their allies maintained a united front against the Central Powers. Brutal trench warfare on land, and submarine and naval blockades at sea did not advance the lot of civilization. Yet, the coalition remained intact.

Despite the enormous cost of the war and the distance of Europe from American shores, Wilson's America committed itself to the terrific costs of a modern land war. By late spring 1918 fresh divisions of American soldiers under General Pershing engaged German forces threatening Paris. The expeditionary force used French and British tanks and artillery because American weapons had yet to arrive. Logistical limitations notwithstanding, the American war effort was critical to the defeat of the Germans, who decided finally that they could not sustain a war against the fresh resources of the United States. More than a hundred thousand U.S. soldiers died in the spring, summer, and fall of 1918; this paled in comparison to the sacrifices of the other combatants, but it was enough. Power in the technocratic age was a function of the new technological means of war; it was also a function of absolute manpower and the political will to use it. In these

²²⁰ Alfred F. Havighurst, *Britain in Transition: The Twentieth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 150–67; Robert Briffault, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1938), 169–73; Max Beloff, *Imperial Sunset*, 2 vols. (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1987), 1:297–56; Philippe Bernard, *The Decline of the Third Republic, 1914–1938* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 93–127; Christopher M. Andrew and A. S. Kanya-Forstner, *The Climax of French Imperial Expansion, 1914–1924* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1981), 209–51.

calculations, the necessary course of action was clear when a country had lost the ability to fight. The Germans, exhausted and without reserves, finally capitulated to the Allies.

American participation in the war had been directly related to the actions of the German high command. It occurred as a result of a firm challenge to American sea rights and the destruction of American ships by the German navy. The senators and congressmen who debated Wilson's war resolution in the first week of April were very clear about what precipitated American intervention and what the general ideology was. From the floors of both houses of Congress, but especially the Senate, the speeches demanded that this be a war for human freedom. The ultimate cause of the war and America's entry was the expansionist designs of the Prussian upper class. Prussian militarism had captured the German nation and had turned her into an authoritarian war machine that threatened not only American honor but also vital American interests. The threat, according to one of the senatorial floor leaders, was both moral and economic:

While thus battling for our own most vital interests we are also contending for the rights of humanity and civilization. Do those who now counsel peace and submission to Germany fully realize the present great distress to which they invite us? Last year our total exports amounted to \$5,481,000. Out of this, \$3,382,000 was exported to the allied belligerent countries, with which Germany now prohibits us from having any commercial intercourse whatsoever.²²¹

The war rhetoric was consistent and bursting with self-righteous resolve. As with every other combatant, the American response was a call to manhood and an appeal to the nationalist soul. Following the acclamation for war, the conflict followed the same patterns that it had followed among the Europeans and that the United States had experienced in its previous military engagements. The First World War was completely consistent with the country's past behavior. With the declaration of war, mass mobilization and the ideology of American nationalism took over. Nationalism, as so many historians and contemporary observers learned, can be a force of enormous strength. It can become an all-consuming power for achieving a particular critical objective. In full bloom, nationhood is at the very heart of personal and cultural identity, often inspiring individuals to perform acts of enormous courage. The members of Congress who voted for war clearly saw the war in terms of their "manhood." This they stated flatly. To ignore the German declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare, in the political context in which it had been made, struck at the very heart of American manhood. The rhetoric that brought the war resolution to the floors of both houses of Congress was imbued with images of America as a heroic nation. The honor and vital interests of the country, and hence its collective manhood, must now be defended. The same image of American exceptionalism that rallied troops under George Washington

²²¹ "Remarks of Senator Gilbert Hitchcock on the floor of the U.S. Senate, April 4, 1917," in Congressional Record 65, no. 1 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1918), 150.

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

carried common soldiers and their political and military leaders alike into the European war. In every respect, the script followed the historical pattern of American intervention in all its previous wars.²²²

The narrative called for the defense of “liberty.” In the modern sense circa 1917, liberty was freedom not only for Americans, but also for the whole of mankind. The literature on American foreign wars suggests that American expansion was due to direct material interests and American masculinity and power. Indeed, American critics of American wars have pointed to those interests to explain expansionist designs on Mexico, Cuba, Hawaii, and indeed in every foreign war in American history. Yet, American justifications for foreign wars have always returned to the idea or ideology of human freedom. This was true whether Americans were fighting Native Americans on the frontier, the Mexican army in the 1840s, the Confederacy in the 1860s, the Spanish in the late 1890s, or the Filipino guerrillas in the early 1900s.²²³ Whether the historical record supported the American claim to higher moral authority or not, the self-image and the narrative of a redeemer nation remained intact. Even if the Wilsonian rhetoric for going to war was too facile to independent observers, American self-definition remained. Even if Wilson’s concepts of universal peace through collective security and self-determination for colonial peoples was far too idealistic, quixotic, and ultimately hypocritical, the image of the United States as a redeeming nation remained quintessential to American consciousness.

²²²German belief in militarism as a logical defense for their civilization was quite widespread, as this 1914 statement by German intellectuals attests:

We instructors at Germany’s universities and institutes of higher learning serve scholarship and carry forth a work of peace. But it fills us with dismay that the enemies of Germany, England at the head, wishes—ostensibly for our benefit—to polarize the spirit of German scholarship from what they call Prussian militarism. In the German army, there is no other spirit than in the German people, for both are one, and we are also a part of it. Our army also nurtures scholarship and can attribute its accomplishments in no small part to it. Service in the army also makes our youth effective for all the works of peace including scholarship. For the army educates them to sacrificial faithfulness to duty and lends them the self-confidence and sense of honor of the truly free man who submits himself willingly to the whole. This spirit doesn’t only exist in Prussia, but it is the same in all the lands of the German Reich. It is the same in war or peace. Now our army stands in battle for Germany’s freedom and thereby for all the assets of peace and morality—not just in Germany alone. Our belief is that salvation for the very culture of Europe depends on the victory that German “militarism” will gain: manly virtue, faithfulness, the will to sacrifice found in the united, free German people. (“Declaration of Professors in the German Reich,” 23 October 1914, translated and printed in the World War I Document Archive, <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~rdh/wwi/1914/profeng.html>)

²²³See, for example, Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Montezumas*; Kristin Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); John Tebbel, *America’s Great Patriotic War with Spain: Mixed Motives, Lies and Racism in Cuba and the Philippines, 1898–1915* (Manchester, VT: Marshall Jones, 1996).

The imperial script for American expansion constructed the psychological prism through which Americans viewed the Great War in 1917. It was the prism, or the modality, that allowed the country to come to the aid of its European allies in the spring of 1917.²²⁴ Dualism in American foreign relations allowed both imperialism and a commitment to the international expansion of democratic principles. Behind the idealism about human freedom were potent means of amassing a huge and aggressive war machine. The country already had a long history of territorial expansion and genuine wars involving field armies and naval forces. The Germans invited war, as they certainly knew, when they maintained their submarine war unabated in the North Atlantic. The loss of international standing to an antidemocratic nation-state represented a challenge to the very concept of American governance and nationality. The German refusal to accede to American demands for the respect of neutral rights echoed the same demands made on Great Britain during the Napoleonic wars. War was decided upon to defend the international position of the United States, and hence that of the political democracies in Great Britain and France. Finally, the West delegated to the United States its long-awaited role as the defender of liberal internationalism. Woodrow Wilson said the war was to make the “world safe for democracy.” He meant that completely. Yet, underneath Wilson’s eloquent rhetoric were the subtler principles of managerial internationalism: balancing power in the international system, promoting free trade and parliamentary rule, and strengthening the body of international law.²²⁵

A mixture of imperialism, militarism, social science, and liberalism informed America’s and Woodrow Wilson’s foreign policy in 1917. Rhetoric extolling the virtues of American democracy went hand in hand with the expansion of American suzerainty in Central America and the Caribbean. A belief in universal democracy and the benefits of scientific knowledge was juxtaposed with the stark reality that the world was not scientific or democratic, and that American statesmen would make decisions that reflected the interests of American power. Nonetheless, the liberal technocratic script engaged Woodrow Wilson in pursuit of a world shaped by Americanism and the new technocratic age. His articulation of the “Fourteen Points” contained both practical and doctrinal positions upon the nature of a war settlement. It also demonstrated an inspired and idealistic conception of international order that paradoxically caught the imagination of the superior-minded Europeans who in earlier times had condescended upon American

²²⁴Kenton J. Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries in the Philippines, 1898–1916: An Inquiry into American Colonial Mentality* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986); Ernest May, *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay* (New York: Atheneum, 1968); John Holladay Latane, *America as a World Power, 1897–1907* (New York: Harper, 1907); Edmund J. Carpenter, *The American Advance: A Study in Territorial Expansion* (New York: J. Lane, 1903); Richard Van Alstyne, *The Rising American Empire: Its Historical Pattern and Evolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960); Scott Nearing and Joseph Freeman, *Dollar Diplomacy: A Study in American Imperialism* (New York: Viking, 1925).

²²⁵Knock, *To End All Wars*, 15–50; Ambrosius, *Woodrow Wilson*, 1–14; Ninkovich, *Modernity and Power*, 44–68, 151–202.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

culture and its democratic pretenses. In its fullest form, Wilsonian internationalism articulated a highly sophisticated, complex system of international control. Detailed in the analyses of his Commission to Negotiate Peace, or the "Inquiry," and in the legal protocols for the League of Nations, the principles of a new technocratic organization for the postwar world took form. In their superficial forms, Wilson's ideas were indeed platitudinous. However, behind those ideas was a compilation of American social science. It was science meant to affect international public policy. Wilson was confident in the body of knowledge he had at his disposal. In his knowledge bank were the extensive information and analyses written by several hundred scholars working for the United States government. In thousands of pages of documents written by these experts, there was a compendium of economic, historical, sociological, geographical, and demographic information available to national governments and international organizations.²²⁶

Despite the legacy of American imperialism, the orientation of Wilson and his administration toward the Great War was framed by the traditional image of Europe in American foreign policy. The corruption of the old empires, shameful progenitors of imperialism and monarchist government, had left the world's subject peoples in a state of poverty and dependency. The American ideal was emancipation through the externalization of the republican ideals of the progressive era. The new script, in part a response to the fear of revolution, embodied some of the aspirations of European and Third World nationalists. It was a conservative and gradualist program for international social change, tempered by the legacy of Anglo-American racism. Wilson himself belied his progressive ideals with a general belief in the supremacy of European or white civilization.²²⁷ It was no accident that at the Versailles peace conference, Wilson refused to accede to Japanese demands for a commitment to racial equality. American sponsorship of a postwar liberal order envisioned an orderly, antirevolutionary program for moving the world toward a democratic model. The cultured and moneyed elites who dominated both political parties favored free trade liberalism, an expanding canon of international law, and a rational arrangement for the avoidance of great power conflicts. All of these structural characteristics would be part of a new liberal international order based upon the new forms of scientific and technological knowledge. Yet, despite these provisos, Wilsonian internationalism inspired liberal internationalists around the world with the promise of national independence and a system of international relations that would free the world from the naked aggression of foreign imperialism. In the last analysis, the narrative that followed Wilson's Fourteen Points was quintessentially a crystallization of American progressivism and its Christian social gospel. The rhetoric of

²²⁶*The records of the Commission to Negotiate Peace, or the "Inquiry," are deposited in the National Archives in Washington. See the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, General Records of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace (Washington, DC: National Archives, 1970), microforms; Lawrence E. Gelfand, The Inquiry: American Preparations for Peace, 1917–1919 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963), 32–78, 343–49.*

²²⁷*Ambrosius, Woodrow Wilson, 120–21.*

the Fourteen Points was full of the idealism and millennial traits so characteristic of American culture.²²⁸

Irrespective of the political divisions within American society, which showed themselves in the anti-German war hysteria of 1918 and the wartime legislation suppressing First Amendment freedoms, Woodrow Wilson, stalwart of liberal progressivism, embodied the American script. Wilson formed the American script from his intellectual exchanges with a whole range of early twentieth-century liberal internationalists inspired by populism and the progressive movement's desires to externalize the social democratic ethos of their movement. He incorporated some of the ideas and perspectives of his 1916 left coalition and combined it with the military requirements for waging a global war. The rhetoric of self-determination for European minorities and the peaceful adjudication of international conflicts was juxtaposed with the Wilson administration's war mobilization. The size and power of the American expeditionary force, financed and propagandized by a formidable domestic national security state, turned the tide against the Germans in the summer of 1918. By combining progressive internationalism, traditional American nationalism, and the military realism of his wartime allies, Wilson created the American script for the First World War. By virtue of his high office, the American narrative for the conflict was defined by Wilson's particular ideological framework. It was an ideology born of his strict Protestant upbringing and the body of American intellectual thought that established American social science in the late nineteenth century. Despite latter repudiations by scholars and statesmen, Wilsonian internationalism, a synthesis of progressive beliefs about the nature of the international system, was to become his enduring legacy.²²⁹

Technocratic Institutions

International war requires the mobilization of all of a society's resources. To greater or lesser degrees of efficacy, the same mobilization process was found among all the combatant nations of the First World War. Inevitably, industrial-era wars have been machinelike, emulating the fundamental processes of the technocratic age. The Wilsonian war machine integrated the economic, political, and strategic resources of the nation-state to support American intervention in a world war. Once more, the machine analogy is appropriate. The components of the machine were social and psychological, political and diplomatic, economic and military. In turn, each of these components had many hundreds of subcomponents connected to institutions and institutional systems. When America went to war, the nation's script mobilized at every level. Institutional and epistemological systems generated the necessary large-scale responses to the national emergency.²³⁰

²²⁸*Ibid.*, 34–37, 47.

²²⁹Niels Aage Thorsen, *The Political Thought of Woodrow Wilson* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 182–234; Arthur S. Link, *The Higher Realism of Woodrow Wilson* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971), 127–39.

²³⁰Cuff, *War Industries Board*, 148–90; Kennedy, *Over Here*, 93–143; Koistinen, *Mobilizing for Modern War*, 166–267.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

To many observers, the need for mobilization was not yet apparent in the spring of 1917. As noted earlier, the country was wholly unprepared for war. It lacked the large-scale forces and armaments necessary to project a credible threat to the German army on the Western front. This reflected in part the historical ambivalence of America's response to the world. Yet it also reflected the suddenness by which the Wilson administration had moved toward war. Neutrality was still the much-preferred status quo until the final break with Germany over its naval war. In a matter of a couple of months, neutrality was completely abandoned and the United States found itself mobilizing for a conflict it had never really envisioned. By 1917, as an industrial power, the country was without peer. Its vast resources of food, fuel, metals, capital equipment, and trained manpower, as well as virtually all of the available capital, made it a military power without military assets. The Germans hoped they could win before that enormous potential was mobilized to aid the exhausted British and French armies. They hoped that an American impact would not be felt before the Allies were brought to their knees by the blockade of Great Britain.²³¹

The most important alternative to Wilson's liberal internationalism was the philosophy of his archrival, Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt and his Republican allies, including Henry Cabot Lodge, Charles Evans Hughes, and much of the military's senior officer corps viewed international relations in classic balance-of-power terms. They subscribed to the necessary use of force—based on strategic or military realism—in their understanding of international relations. Roosevelt's views had long been influenced by the navalist theories of Mahan and his own research on American military history. Before the First World War and during it, Roosevelt viewed German sea power as an inherent threat to American vital interests. He had encountered German expansionism during his own presidency some ten years earlier, and he was loath to appease an adversary of such apparent ruthlessness and geostrategic ambition. Rooseveltian ideology, circa the First World War, differed from Wilsonian internationalism in the practical considerations of the use of force over diplomacy. Wilson brought the world a new concept of international development and a world body dedicated to a liberal progressive vision for human civilization. The corporate internationalism of the age was substantially the same for both Wilsonian and Rooseveltian orientations. The international public sector, however, was only possible for those who believed in the institutional arrangements afforded by diplomacy and international law. Roosevelt and his conservative nationalists rejected this. They were military realists and saw international control in terms of preserving the classic balance of power. The world, as Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Charles Evans Hughes saw it, was in need of strategic more than legal mechanisms for collective defense.²³²

²³¹*Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "January, 1917 Report of the German Conference Concerning Unrestricted Submarine Warfare," in Official German Documents Relating to the World War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1923), 2:1320–21.*

²³²*John Carver Edwards, Patriots in Pinstripe: Men of the National Security League (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982), 17–38; Cooper, The Warrior and the Priest, 266–86; Beale, Theodore Roosevelt, 448–62.*

For conservative nationalists, the German strategic threat of dominating France and Britain and controlling the Atlantic Ocean placed America at risk. Dedicated to the same principles of early twentieth-century progressivism as Wilson, Roosevelt envisioned a similar world of open markets and expanding democracy. His intended means, however, remained somewhat different. Roosevelt preferred war with the Central Powers before Wilson did. He saw no alternative to defeating the Central Powers through American intervention. He would have delivered the same troops to the Western front in eastern France, only earlier. Both Wilson and Roosevelt blessed the new technocratic machines of industrialism. The modern corporation and the new sources of power, production, and communication so evident in American industry were all viewed as vital to the nation's prosperity and international prestige and security. In a sense, Wilson and Roosevelt were quite different in understanding the utility and value of the military force in world affairs. In another sense, their commitment to the new technocratic ethos and their shared passion for American exceptionalism made them one and the same.

Despite the profound lack of preparation, when war was declared the nation responded with enormous determination. Massive logistical engineering was required to field the forces necessary for the conflict. Procurement of men, supplies, and transportation involved scores of government agencies. The War Industries Board, under Bernard Baruch, organized private industry to produce the essential war goods, including munitions and weapons systems. The country had to organize and train entire divisions of fresh conscripts. Ships, airplanes, artillery, firearms of all kinds, supply trucks, food, uniforms, and other critical goods were produced by the institutions of the warfare state. The technocratic machine was measured by its ability to coalesce and control the largest expeditionary force in military history.²³³ The war machine also included the carefully orchestrated war propaganda that all the combatant nations engaged in generously. Violent anti-German sentiments were fueled by a mass media that demonized the enemy for its reading public. Herbert David Croly's Committee on Public Information attempted successfully to propagandize the American war effort in the United States and around the world. The Wilson administration was capable of winning the public's confidence by extolling the virtues of the war in sustaining American ideals.²³⁴ The war was indeed a tragedy. Yet, a greater tragedy would be to lose Europe and the vast colonial empires to the Germans and the Austrians.

²³³Cuff, *War Industries Board, 191–219*; *U.S. War Industries Board, American Industry in the War* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1921); *U.S. War Industries Board, Munitions Industry* (February, 1919) (Washington, DC: GPO, 1935); *Center of Military History, United States Army in the World War*.

²³⁴Vaughn, *Holding Fast the Inner Lines*, 141–92; *Frederick Henry Lynch, President Wilson and the Moral Aims of the War* (New York: Fleming, 1918); *Willis Fletcher Johnson, America and the Great War for Humanity and Freedom* (Philadelphia: J. C. Winston, 1917).

American Internationalism: Technocratic Principles

The technocratic institutions and knowledge systems of the Great War were new and unrefined. Historical knowledge, based mainly on narrative and some descriptive statistics, was a primary basis for public policy analysis. The second decade of the twentieth century was early in the technocratic era. The concept of an international system governed by economic regimes and political laws had only emerged within the last hundred years. The mechanisms for managing a global system had only begun to be constructed. The nation-state itself, as a technocratic institutional system, had emerged prototypically in the progressive-era institution building in the United States. The Federal Reserve, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the expanded functions of the State and War Departments were indeed very recent. The massive technocratic knowledge that would begin to emerge from American universities was still in the future when Wilson formulated his postwar vision for the international system. Nonetheless, the Wilson administration produced nearly two thousand reports on international topics to support its diplomatic mission to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

The Wilson administration viewed international political economy in classic liberal terms. Opening the protected cartels of the European empires through free trade would lay the basis for economic and political development and universal prosperity. Corporate capitalism, a product of industrialism, was viewed as a force for development and, ultimately, democracy. Wilson argued that international law would be able to establish a free-market international environment in which self-determination through representative government could thrive. This was the underlying framework of the Fourteen Points proposal for ending the Great War. Wilson's ideology and foreign policy were an articulation of a new form of internationalism. I have termed it technocratic internationalism, in the sense that the institutions and knowledge forms of the new age subscribed to a new concept of managerial control. The postwar plans for international law and commerce envisioned the skeletal framework for the new technocratic age. In sum, Wilsonianism represented a vision for an institutional and epistemological framework for a managed system of liberal internationalism.²³⁵

Wilson emphasized the rule of law as the preferred mechanism for implementing social control over the international community. Treaty law would discipline a world that was infused with brutal militarism, as evidenced by the civilian atrocities committed by the Central Powers, unrestricted submarine warfare, and deadly weapons systems that both sides used against each other.²³⁶ Wilson thought a means of managing the great powers through law and diplomacy would build a sustainable international system. His

²³⁵Ambrosius, Woodrow Wilson, 136–71.

²³⁶Wilson, of course, was wrong, at least for the twentieth century. William R. Keylor, "Versailles and International Diplomacy," in Manfred F. Boemeke, Gerald D. Feldman, and Elisabeth Glaser, eds., *The Treaty of Versailles: A Reassessment after 75 Years* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 469–505; Arthur Pearson Scott, *An Introduction to the Peace Treaties* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1920).

administration's Committee on Public Inquiry worked prodigiously through 1917 and 1918 to compile historical, economic, demographic, and political information for the eventual settlement of the war. In this framework, the technocratic was found in the organization of a managerial system for the governance of international relations. Irrespective of underlying destructive forces in national political cultures, Wilson's view was that war could be controlled, if not eliminated, by precise legal arrangements and controls. The world would be measured according to its adherence to quantifiable goals for democracy, economic development, and military compliance.²³⁷

Technocratic planning involves the creation of carefully delineated documents—legal, economic, technical, and scientific—for the application of a system of control over institutions, resources, and people. The Versailles Treaty was exactly this. With more than four hundred separate provisions, it was highly compartmentalized and programmatic. It was compiled by “experts” assigned by the represented nations at the conference for the development of a thorough plan for war settlement. Separate national planning committees, which worked continuously over several months, composed the specific provisions for each aspect of the treaty. Each stipulation had clear intent: the effective control of German behavior in the postwar system.²³⁸ The Versailles Treaty was amended by several hundred articles that set very clear restrictions on the economic, military, and political power of the postwar German state. All of the defeated powers ceded vast areas of territory. The empires of Turkey, Austria, and Germany were dismantled. In Eastern Europe, the successor states formed the modern nations of the region. In the Middle East, the Turkish possessions were surrendered to France and Great Britain under League of Nations mandates. In Africa, German colonies were surrendered to the same colonial powers. The few German islands in the Pacific were divided between the Japanese, British, and French. Of course, the terms of the war settlement required a full accounting of the security concerns of the victors. The new Europe, according to the victorious powers, needed to be built on a stable and pacific regional system in which the territorial disputes between nation-states would not escalate into a global power struggle. The creators of the treaty hoped, albeit in vain, to contain the German republic through the rationality of legal technocratic stipulations, as well as through the founding of the first global political body, the League of Nations.²³⁹ The Allies hoped that integrating Germany into the new international organization for collective defense and multilateral diplomacy, combined with the enforcement of the

²³⁷ Ambrosius, Woodrow Wilson, 47–55; Klaus Schwabe, Woodrow Wilson, Revolutionary Germany, and Peacemaking, 1918–1919: Missionary Diplomacy and the Realities of Power (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 352–407; Gelfand, *The Inquiry*, 181–223.

²³⁸ Schwabe, Woodrow Wilson, 352–94; Ambrosius, Woodrow Wilson, 107–30.

²³⁹ Michael Graham Fry, “British Revisionism,” in Boemeke, Feldman, and Glaser, *The Treaty of Versailles*, 565–601; C. K. Webster, *The League of Nations in Theory and Practice* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1933).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

agreed restrictions on German rearmament by the organization, would save the world from future German aggression. History showed that this was not to happen.²⁴⁰

The Wilson administration opposed the severity of the treaty on obvious grounds. How could there be peace with humiliation? The Germans accepted the treaty because Allied demands were nonnegotiable. Despite the intentions of the great powers to produce a treaty and a postwar international system that would preserve world peace, the punitive provisions of Versailles were mandated by the magnitude of loss and the desire for retribution. Tragically, the Germans never accepted the fundamental nature of the agreement. Even before the rise of National Socialism, Germany had no intention of fawning forever to an enemy that had tried to starve its population, killed huge legions of its young men, forced the surrender of its overseas empire, and left the nation's economy and international prestige in a state of absolute humiliation.

The technocratic script required precise definitions and numerical limits on German military power, as well as deep economic concessions. The military stipulations of the treaty (which were violated immediately) included strict limits on all military assets. The treaty limited the size of German warships to no more than ten thousand tons displacement while the other powers were building warships several times larger). The country, the second largest in Europe, was allowed a standing army of no more than a hundred thousand men. Severe limits were also placed on the types of airplanes and artillery the army could possess and in what quantities.²⁴¹

Economic punishment included the required reparation payments in many billions of marks and the ceding of the Rhineland valley and the large coalfields of the Ruhr to France (in compensation for the destruction of French coal mines in northeastern France). The Versailles Treaty was very particular in its requirements. Each of the hundreds of applicable amendments outlined specific legal controls on German military, economic, and political life. In this, the technocratic script was everywhere, from the statistical calculations of military and economic assets to the demographics of displaced European populations.²⁴² The engineering of the peace settlement emphasized the rationality and logic of law, science, and technology. What had been overlooked were the complex

²⁴⁰Sally Marks, *The Illusion of Peace: International Relations in Europe, 1918–1933* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976). By 1935, the *Versailles Treaty* was a dead letter. At the announcement of the creation of a new *Wehrmacht* with thirty-six divisions, the German public was ecstatic:

Special editions of newspapers were rushed out, eulogizing "the first great measure to liquidate Versailles," the erasing of the shame of defeat, and the restoration of Germany's military standing. Delirious crowds gathered outside the Reich Chancellery cheering Hitler. (Kershaw, *Hubris*, 551)

²⁴¹See Edward W. Bennett, *German Rearmament and the West, 1932–1933* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), 11–77.

²⁴²Sally Marks, "Smoke and Mirrors: In Smoke-Filled Rooms and the *Galerie des Glaces*," in Boemeke, Feldman, and Glaser, *The Treaty of Versailles*, 337–70; Elizabeth Glaser, "The Making of the Economic Peace," in *ibid.*, 371–99; David Stevenson, "French War Aims and Peace Planning," in *ibid.*, 87–109; U.S. Government. *Treaty of Versailles* (1919) (Washington, DC: GPO, 1920).

emotional demands that coercive treaties place on national populations. As a new generation of British and French citizens learned, the most stringent constraints placed upon a defeated enemy will not ensure his obedience. The appeasement of German power in the 1930s demonstrated the dangerous fallacies of belief in an international order based primarily on contractual relations between international adversaries. Without the political will to maintain involuntary constraints through the use of military force, no manner of diplomatic protest or negotiation would preserve the status quo. In many respects, the conflict between the desire for disarmament and peace in a rational international order and the stark reality of international relations mirrored the mind of President Wilson.²⁴³ The former college professor and university president had the intellectual insight to recognize the important role that collective memory and comparative military strengths played in the international system. In his own life history, he had to weigh his intellectual attachment to analytical training in law and political science against his emotional attachment to Christianity and his stubborn, often called “rigid,” belief in the rightness of his actions.²⁴⁴

The Russian Script

While Wilson, Lloyd George, and Clemenceau were engaged at Versailles, the Russians were completing their own momentous revolution very independently. For centuries, Russia had been an insular nation. The West was kept at bay by the xenophobia of Russia’s rulers and by the vast tracts of land that separated the cosmopolitan centers of Western and Central Europe from the Russian heartland. Beginning in the eighteenth century, the insularity that had maintained the semifeudal and authoritarian characteristics of imperial Russia was breached by the gradual acculturation of the Russian aristocracy and merchant class to the West. By the time of the Great War, the Russians were undergoing fairly rapid social, economic, and political change.²⁴⁵ The Romanovs, under pressure from the new classes of workers, liberal thinkers, and radicals who had been gaining strength and numbers in Russia since the mid-nineteenth century, were in the process of providing a path of transition from the old absolutist state to an ordered liberty provided by a constitutional monarchy. Indeed, when Nicholas I was forced to abdicate in February 1917, the country had already been under a form of limited parliamentary rule since the revolution of 1905.²⁴⁶ The technocratic age bore down upon the Russian empire first with technological change and new independent intellectuals, and then with the war that forced the overthrow of four empires. The Russian Revolution brought the issues of industrial political economy and the old aristocracy to the center of

²⁴³ Ambrosius, Woodrow Wilson, 292–98; Knock, *To End All Wars*, 273.

²⁴⁴ Ambrosius, Woodrow Wilson, 12–13, 211–41; Knock, *To End All Wars*, 194–226; Alexander L. George, Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A Personality Study (New York: J. Day, 1956), 268–313.

²⁴⁵ Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 51–152; Abraham Ascher, P. A. Stolypin: The Search for Stability in Late Imperial Russia (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), 264–362.

²⁴⁶ Pipes, *Russian Revolution*, 152–94; Ascher, Stolypin, 208–60.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

action. The new technocratic age could be liberal, as Western political leaders and industrialists viewed the future, or it could be socialist and authoritarian. In Wilsonianism, the world was shown the outlines of a liberal technocratic order in which democracy and capitalism would fashion a world system that would spread individualism and other Western concepts of modernization. The foundations of the liberal order depended upon the long-term prospects for the development of market economies and parliamentary-based governments. In Russia, the Marxist view of the liberal world came to power with Lenin. Instead of a liberal or capitalist world, the Marxist-Leninist ideology created the totalitarian socialist state.²⁴⁷

Lenin's script combined the romantic, the technocratic, and the absolutist doctrines of Russian radicalism. The romantic in Lenin inspired his beliefs in revolution as an instrument of social justice or redemption. The technocratic in Lenin suggested a view of capitalism as part of Marx's science of history. Industrial—that is, technocratic—societies, according to the early communist revolutionaries, followed the laws of history. In their absolutism, Lenin and the other Bolsheviks modeled their behavior on that of Russia's royal house, which for centuries had not shared any real power with anyone but themselves.²⁴⁸

Lenin's beliefs and praxis eventually led him to make Russia the proving grounds for the establishment of the first proletarian state. Then the revolution would spread, or so he thought, to Eastern and Central Europe and ultimately around the world, ending capitalism and bringing the world into an age of socialist freedom for the common man. The party, a tightly disciplined doctrinal-based organization, would crush its opponents with absolute ruthlessness. Through discipline and calculated terror, Lenin proposed to create a new society. In this design were the founding elements of the modern totalitarian socialist state that Lenin's successor, Stalin, perfected for the Soviet Union and for export around the world.²⁴⁹

²⁴⁷Robert Service, *Lenin: A Biography* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 391–434; Adam B. Ulam, *The Bolsheviks: The Intellectual and Political History of the Triumph of Communism in Russia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 477–93. According to Ulam, before a Comintern meeting Lenin denounced a foreign communist for asserting that the workers should not be made to suffer in a “worker’s state” (p. 477). Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Bolshevik Regime, 1919–1924* (London: Harvill, 1997), 240–435. Pipes made the point that communism and fascism were not so much polar opposites but “rivals for the same constituencies” (p. 240); Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 506–60.

²⁴⁸Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 53–61.

²⁴⁹E. A. Rees, “Leaders and Their Institutions,” in Paul R. Gregory, ed., *Behind the Façade of Stalin’s Command Economy: Evidence from the Soviet State and Party Archives* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2001), 35–60; Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia during the 1930s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999) and *Stalin’s Peasants* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Philip Boobbyer, *The Stalin Era* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 30–99; Chris Ward, *Stalin’s Russia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 138–47.

Lenin accepted the concept introduced by Marx with respect to revolutionary change. In the view of Marx and Lenin, the existing institutions of a bourgeois society could not be reformed, as liberals would want. Rather, the only way to bring about the socialist society envisioned by Marx, Lenin, and other revolutionary socialists was to demolish the old institutions and establish worker and party control over the bastions of power. In Lenin's strict totalitarian ideology, the revolutionary state was a weapon to be used with vengeance. The pillars of the old regime needed to be not only dismantled but also destroyed, to the degree that counterrevolutionary activities would never occur.²⁵⁰ Just as Hitler would do to Germany in scarcely half a generation, Lenin and his followers did to the remains of the Russian Empire. The Soviet Union, a nation-state and a technocratic institutional system of formidable totalitarian design, took a semifeudal, mainly agrarian society and, in due time, transformed it into a thoroughly militarized industrial state. Its political elites would be dedicated to the expansion of the state into every aspect of national life. They would also be completely committed, as a matter of revolutionary doctrine, to spreading the ideology of the state to every area of the world.²⁵¹

The Great War was the essential catalyst for Russia's radicals to seize power from the czarist regime. The Russian script had begun to change in response to Russia's integration into the international economic system. Now, the capitalist modernization script was deeply traumatized by the massive land war with the Germans and the Austrians. Lenin seized power, taking the opportunity afforded by the shattering of both the old imperial and new modernization narratives. Lenin and his chief deputy, Leon Trotsky, organized the left into a military and ideological force to destroy the remnants of the old order and the new liberal regime. They consolidated power in Russia, much like the Nazis would do in Germany some fifteen years later. Once potential opponents had been liquidated, the revolution continued the practice of destruction. The new script formed out of the immolation of the old was still in most respects thoroughly Russian. The old script had organized society as a highly stratified traditional monarchy. The country was ruled by the czar and the hereditary classes of royal court subjects and landed nobility. The same authoritarian mentality pervaded the revolution. The Russians built their new script by discarding the liberal technocratic idea of capitalism and replacing it with the more Russian concepts of centralized authority, repression, and control. In a real sense, a totalitarian ideology had found a society predisposed to its precepts.²⁵²

²⁵⁰Service, Lenin, 394–431; James White, Lenin: The Practice and Theory of Revolution (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 129–202; Pipes, The Russian Revolution, 789–842.

²⁵¹Allan Bullock, Hitler and Stalin: Parallel Lives (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), 423–563.

²⁵²Pipes, The Russian Revolution, 1–52; Hans Rogger, Russia in the Age of Modernization and Revolution (London: Longman, 1983), 14–69; Martin McCauley and Peter Waldron, The Emergence of the Modern Russian State, 1855–81 (Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble Books, 1988); J. N. Westwood, Endurance and Endeavor: Russian History 1812–1992 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 1–84; Dominic Lieven, Russia's Rulers under the Old Regime (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

At the end of the war, little was known that could be confirmed about the state of Russia. To contemporary observers, the revolution looked to be a strange and frightening transformation of the czar's empire. The end of the First World War had left Russia in a state of revolutionary chaos. Invaded by Western armies attempting to win a civil war for the counterrevolutionary forces, the Bolsheviks and their military force, the Red Army, fought to consolidate the revolution.²⁵³ True to the principles of Marxist revolution, Lenin moved to eviscerate the imperial legacy of the Romanovs but retain its territorial domain for the socialist state. Following the absolute dictates of Lenin, the communist machine, represented by its secret police, the Cheka, crushed regime opponents with absolute ruthlessness. Millions perished in the immediate postrevolutionary period, 1918 to 1921, many through starvation, but many others through execution. Lenin, Trotsky, and the rest of the communist leadership would implement a script formed by the confluence of radical ideology and the authoritarian culture traditional to Russia. The new Russian script would be the Soviet script. It would assimilate the old Russian authoritarian culture and the new technocratic ideology—the doctrine of Marxist thought and the imperial demeanor of a semifeudal empire. The technocratic organization of the Soviet Union was, part and parcel, implicit in the thinking of communist theorists and leaderships. Scientific socialism, the implementation of Marxist theory in the planning of society, was the *sine qua non* of the Bolshevik Revolution. How else could the Soviet Union survive if it did not challenge the advanced industrialism and scientific discoveries of the bourgeois West?²⁵⁴

In the course of the twentieth century, Marxism-Leninism became the ultimate technocratic planning system. That it failed in the end does not militate against the concept. Clearly, Marxist doctrine always has viewed the entire world in terms of the idea of production. In political analysis, a learned Marxist would always view the question of political control of production as the central objective of any regime. In the Russian context, the Marxist project worked toward the development of a “scientific socialism” for Russia and the world. Society would be both “liberated” and engineered. As the archaic and repressive structures of old Russia, including both state and civil society, fell to revolution, they would be replaced by the quintessential Marxist institution: the dictatorship of the proletariat. In postcapitalist Russia, the Bolsheviks believed the energies of the working class, repressed by wage labor under the bourgeoisie, would liberate society. Just as the Versailles Treaty attempted to structure a new European state system in which liberal capitalism could prosper without the danger of a new German militarism, so the Russian and now the Soviet script promised a postwar socialist state—indeed socialist world—rid of the evils of feudalism and capitalism.²⁵⁵ The Wilsonians viewed the Soviets as a primary threat to liberal internationalism. The Wilsonians

²⁵³Pipes, *Russia under the Bolshevik Regime*, 52–140; *Ulam*, *The Bolsheviks*, 449–76.

²⁵⁴R. W. Davies, *The Industrialization of Soviet Russia*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980–1996); Mark Beissinger, *Scientific Management, Socialist Discipline, and Soviet Power* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 35–90.

²⁵⁵*Ulam*, *The Bolsheviks*, 314–81.

believed the Soviets were more inspired by control than by freedom for the human spirit. Once more, the technocratic script divided between separate ideologies. On the one hand was the liberal view of an open world economic system, growing through the interdependence of markets of all kinds. On the other was the opposite view of modernity, the socialist alternative to capitalism. To make things somewhat more complicated, the extreme nationalist movements of the 1920s and 1930s formed a third class of ideology, namely, fascism.²⁵⁶

The Failure of the Liberal Script

As we have seen, Wilson and his small coterie of advisers worked continuously for six months to fashion a treaty that would redefine international relations. He was driven to establish a legal framework for the vision of progressive internationalism that captured world public opinion, the Fourteen Points. In the end, however, the final diplomatic arrangements required by Great Britain and France imposed an enormous punitive burden on the Germans. Further, the future framework was destined to be impractical without the full participation of the United States. The acknowledged victor and leader of the redeemer nation, Wilson, tragically lost at Versailles. He would see the crown of the treaty, the outline for the League of Nations, fail ratification in the Senate. He would not live to see the destructive war of the 1940s that was a direct result of the unfinished tasks of the Great War. He would live to see the consolidation of the Soviet state but not the sweeping ramifications of that revolution on twentieth-century history. In the end, of course, the liberal design for international order failed. The post-World War I international system was never to achieve the ordered liberty and prosperity envisioned by Wilsonian ideology.²⁵⁷

The Western metascript, built over several centuries on balance-of-power realism, lacked the institutional machinery for an effective postwar international system. Since the emergence of a community of nation-states in early modern Europe, international order had been premised upon the balance of power between major powers. Each nation-state, a conglomeration of groups and institutions, formed its narrative according to the intricate details of its national history. In effect, a country followed a pattern incorporated into its collective identity, that is, a historical script. The Great War affected a huge multinational narrative whose experiences followed a wide spectrum, from revolution and widespread destruction to the sustained victory that was the prize for Woodrow Wilson's America. Each nation involved in the Great War experienced through an unfolding of interior narratives, from antiwar to pro-war demonstrations and from deprivations and war traumas to political and social revolutions. The Wilsonian script for postwar peace, a fulfillment of the Enlightenment's vision for international relations, was not connected to the historical conditions of its time. It was a wish, a chimera of

²⁵⁶Ninkovich, *The Wilsonian Century*, 116–48; Roger Eatwell, *Fascism: A History* (New York: Allen Lane, 1996), 3–39; Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism, 1914–1945* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 80–289.

²⁵⁷Ambrosius, *Woodrow Wilson*, 251–98; Knock, *To End All Wars*, 210–45.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

American exceptionalism that the world would never wholly accept, even if Woodrow Wilson or later Franklin Roosevelt were astride it.²⁵⁸

It was not feasible to create peace without a universal political culture that supported it. The war settlement would not bring peace and prosperity to Europe, or to the rest of the world. The Germans found themselves isolated and in large measure unrepentant. Even more radical in their rejection of the West were the Russians, who, as mentioned, watched as Allied armies converged on their homeland. The planning systems effected by nation states and empires were incapable of maintaining themselves in the face of rapid and often belligerent change. The masses of Asia and Africa, as well as the impoverished regions of the Americas and Europe, would not remain under the control of self-indulgent elites. There were too many contradictions in both liberalism and its counterpoised ideology, Marxism-Leninism, to create long-term stability. Perhaps this is why the interwar period was marked by such violent ideological competition between not two but three major political ideologies: liberalism, Marxism-Leninism, and what became known as various forms of fascism.²⁵⁹

Wilson, his health drastically affected by a stroke, would die in a brief retirement. His League of Nations, weakened by the lack of American membership, would collapse with the appeasement script of the 1930s. In the post-Wilsonian technocratic age, the institutional mechanisms, both public and private, for effective control of the international system were not present. The leaders of the interwar period would find that it was not possible to implement effective collective security and global systems of administration for nation-states when the tools for such management had not been created. The political divisions of the world remained not only extremely dangerous but mostly irreconcilable. It was impossible to reestablish genuine trust between the French and the Germans when each side had suffered so grievously and when German democracy was so new and fragile.²⁶⁰

Instead of a just and peaceful world, the catastrophic experience of the First World War left an international system fragile and prone to destabilization. No amount of either corporate or progressive forms of internationalism in America could resolve the internal dynamics of totalitarianism, latent in postwar Germany and emergent in Lenin's Soviet Union. The war had not made democracy safe, to paraphrase Wilson, but, instead, had laid the basis for more sinister tyranny. Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia would emerge full-blown in their totalitarianism as the liberal empires of Western Europe and

²⁵⁸ *Ambrosius*, Woodrow Wilson, 290–98; *Knock*, To End All Wars, 271–76; *Howard Elcock*, Portrait of a Decision: The Council of Four and the Treaty of Versailles (London: Eyre Methuen, 1972), 298–324; *Marks*, Illusion of Peace, 75–136.

²⁵⁹ *Moore*, Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy; *A. James Gregor*, The Faces of Janus: Marxism and Fascism in the Twentieth Century (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); *Payne*, A History of Fascism, 3–19.

²⁶⁰ *Melvyn P. Leffler*, The Elusive Quest: America's Pursuit of European Stability and French Security, 1919–1933 (Durham: University of North Carolina Press, 1979); *Erich Eyck*, A History of the Weimar Republic, 2 vols. (New York: Atheneum, 1972), 1:161–95, 2:448–85.

North America searched for a way to cope with their rise. The liberal script would have to compete with the Leninist and fascist scripts, which, like democratic liberalism, shared origins within Western history and culture. With the failure of ratification of membership in the League of Nations in the U.S. Senate, and the subsequent political defeat of Wilsonian internationalism in the United States, the liberal script had lost an effective means of maintaining the postwar system.²⁶¹

This did not mean that the liberal technocratic order ended with Wilson's failed treaty ratification. On the contrary, despite the animus directed at him by his Republican opponents, the basic framework for postwar corporate internationalism was found in the provisions for war settlement in Europe. American diplomats and corporate executives would work throughout the ensuing decades to promote the commercial and diplomatic accords they believed were necessary to develop a global capitalist economy. This was Wilsonian internationalism in practice. The expansion of international institutions and the continued development of the scientific-industrial epistemologies of the technocratic age remained and, indeed, flourished. Yet, the failure to mobilize American leadership sufficiently in the interwar period promised yet another turn in the national script, as global depression and a second world war confronted the neo-Wilsonian age and the emergent liberal technocratic order.²⁶²

²⁶¹Leffler, *Elusive Quest*, 231–315; Raymond J. Sontag, *A Broken World, 1919–1939* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 269–381.

²⁶²Iriye, *The Globalization of America*, 116–48; Ninkovich, *The Wilsonian Century*, 78–182; Knock, *To End All Wars*, 271–76; Ambrosius, *Woodrow Wilson*, 290–98.

Chapter III

The Interwar System: 1919–1939

The Script Turns: Divergent Paths

In American history, the years between the First and Second World Wars were a tumultuous interlude marked by social change and economic and foreign policy crises. The social change was profound. Within the space of one generation, American society developed a modern urban culture. The machine civilization produced the Jazz Age and Prohibition. It was also a time for the expansion of modernism in the literature of Faulkner, Pound, Eliot, Joyce, Dos Passos, and other literary radicals. Modern scientific thought emerged in the popular consciousness with the Scopes Trial on the teaching of Darwin's theory of evolution. In a country whose core values were born within the Christian cultures of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century post-Reformation Europe, there began an elite movement to absorb the intellectual ferment of contemporary secular consciousness. Scientists and intellectuals influenced by the thought of Freud, Marx, Darwin, and Einstein shaped the cognitive landscape of the 1920s and 1930s. In the midst of a popular culture that impressed the world with Charlie Chaplin, Mae West, W. C. Fields, and Shirley Temple, the elite consciousness of university intellectuals envisaged a new century of modern and postmodern thought. Beyond the popular medium of Hollywood, which was representative of the period, a new era continued its evolutionary course, building on the radical notions of the technocratic age.

After the stock market crash and the Great Depression, the new age collided with the radical politics of the 1930s, pulling the world into the cataclysm of the Second World War. Modernism, born earlier in the century, developed into its mature form. Internationally, the world was being swept with change. The myopic view of Americans insulated by their traditional doctrine of hemispheric isolation was shattered by the rise of fascism. The voice of Adolf Hitler, carried by shortwave radio, became a formidable challenge to the liberal order. Ultimately, the period, in terms of international relations,

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

was a bridge between the first and second catastrophic wars of the century. The tumult restructured the modern world and accelerated the path of the technocratic script.²⁶³

The period itself was complex, bifurcated along the lines of the Great Depression. The 1920s seemed to have marked the onset of modernism as a mature form. It was in the first decade after the collapse of the old European society that industrialism and technocracy began to define the modern state and society. The 1930s were not a regression from the 1920s, but a transition to institutional crises. The particular failings of the first postwar decade were visited upon the second. Postwar capitalism, with new muscular corporations, lacked the technocratic expertise to prevent the enormous crisis of the Great Depression. The system did not just flounder; it shuddered—a result of misunderstood structural economic faults that later generations of technocrats would fix with the mathematical models of economic science.²⁶⁴

²⁶³For modernism in the United States, see Hugh Witemeyer, ed., *The Future of Modernism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997); Norman F. Cantor, *The American Century: Varieties of Culture in Modern Times* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997); Steven Watson, *Prepare for Saints: Gertrude Stein, Virgil Thomson, and the Mainstreaming of American Modernism* (New York: Random House, 1998); Wanda M. Corn, *The Great American Thing: Modern Art and National Identity, 1915–1935* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Michael Thomas Carroll, *Popular Modernity in America: Experience, Technology, Mythohistory* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000); Susan Hegemen, *Patterns for America: Modernism and the Concept of Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999); Jeffrey L. Meikle, *Twentieth Century Limited: Industrial Design in America, 1925–1939* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001); Olivier Zunz, “Producers, Brokers, and Users of Knowledge: The Institutional Matrix,” in Ross, *Modernist Impulses in the Human Sciences, 1870–1930* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 280–303; Mark C. Smith, *In the Crucible: The American Debate over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918–1941* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994); Morton White, *Social Thought in America: The Revolt against Formalism*, rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976); Novick, *That Noble Dream*, 133–278; Noble, *America by Design and Forces of Production: A Social History of Industrial Automation* (New York: Knopf, 1984).

²⁶⁴Peter Temin, *Lessons from the Great Depression* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989); Elmus Wicker, *The Banking Panics of the Great Depression* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989). For a monetarist view of the Great Depression as a deflationary spiral that began in Europe, see H. Clark Johnson, *Gold, France, and the Great Depression, 1919–1932* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 11–43, 177–86; Mark Thomas, ed., *The Disintegration of the World Economy between the World Wars*, 2 vols. (Brookfield, VT: Elgar, 1996); John A. Garraty, *The Great Depression* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986); Rosenof, *Economics in the Long Run*. Another view of the Great Depression has been proposed by the Schumpeterian school of evolutionary economics. Evolutionary theory suggests that the depression was one of the “long waves” (Konratiev waves) that link economic behavior over many decades. The Great Depression, according to contemporary thought in this field, was a result of the adoption or evolution of the mass production system as the paradigm for twentieth-century industrialism. The “structural adjustment” to that paradigm caused the world economic crisis of the 1930s. See Chris Freeman and Francisco Louçã, *As Time Goes By: From the Industrial Revolution to the Information Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 259–65.

However, in both decades, events and processes of seminal importance maintained the tectonic shifts of the twentieth century. Economists learned the workings of the business cycle, while physicists and chemists learned the structure of atomic-level science and began the revolution that resulted in the nuclear age of the Cold War. Likewise, the seeds of cybernetics and the electronic computer were found in laboratories in the United States and Great Britain. In Germany, rocket science began its evolution to the first ballistic weapons of the Second World War, and later, the beginning of the space age. The embryonic workings of the technocratic explosions of the Cold War were found in the interwar generation. In the context of a world of continuing international conflict and rivalry, the use of science for war was of paramount importance. The liberal order, so supportive of the secular scientific projects of the modern period, found itself under the threat of the military-scientific complexes of Nazi Germany and, to a lesser extent, the Soviet Union.²⁶⁵

From 1919 until the world economic crisis of the late 1920s, the technocratic age expanded with new inventions and the phenomenal growth of mass communications. Significantly, the development of new ideas in atomic physics, such as nuclear fission, and the basic theories of cybernetics for machine intelligence, had vastly important implications for civilization. However, for most of the interwar period, the military view of international relations was held in disdain by an international public that remembered the destructiveness of the First World War. The League of Nations continued without the membership of the United States. However, Wilson's legacy in America perpetuated the vigorous American desire for a Wilsonian world of expanding international trade and investment and the peaceful adjudication of international conflicts.²⁶⁶

²⁶⁵Wilhelm Deist, ed., *The German Military in the Age of Total War, 6 vols.* (Dover, NH: Berg, 1985–2000); Barton Whaley, *Covert German Rearmament, 1919–1939: Deception and Misperception* (Frederick, MD: University Publications of America, 1984); Gary Hyland and Anton Gill, *Last Talons of the Eagle: Secret Nazi Technology Which Could Have Changed the Course of World War II* (London: Headline, 1998); Ian V. Hogg, *German Secret Weapons of the Second World War: The Missiles, Rockets, Weapons, and New Technology of the Third Reich* (London: Greenhill Books, 1999); David R. Stone, *Hammer and Rifle: The Militarization of the Soviet Union, 1926–1933* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000); Sally W. Stoeker, *Forging Stalin's Army: Marshal Tukhachevsky and the Politics of Military Innovation* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998); Vitalii Shlykov, *Plans for Stalin's War Machine: Tukachevskii and Military-Economic Planning, 1925–1941* (New York: Macmillan, 1999); Walter S. Dunn Jr., *The Soviet Economy and the Red Army, 1930–1945* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995).

²⁶⁶The protectionist proclivities of successive Republican administrations militated against Wilsonian principles of free trade; nonetheless, an internationalist perspective continued to frame Republican foreign policy in the 1920s, including the goals of financial stability and arms control. Iriye, *The Globalization of America*, 73–115; Frank Costigliola, *Awkward Dominion: American Political, Economic, and Cultural Relations with Europe, 1919–1933* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984), 76–217; Robert David Johnson, *The Peace Progressives and American Foreign Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995); Joan Hoff, *American Business and Foreign Policy, 1920–1933* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), 105–235; Cynthia A.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The Republican ascendancy of the 1920s brought a decidedly pro-business climate to the national government and to U.S. foreign relations. The Republican administrations of the 1920s made it a priority to support the expansion of American business around the world. The growth of multinational corporations projected American business interests across the Atlantic and the Pacific. The postwar corporate ideal reflected a belief in the utilitarian mastery of economic and political life by executives and engineers trained in the organizational methods of industrial planning and control. The vast inequities of economic class and the imperial nature of the international system under the League of Nations did not offend the sensibilities of conservative American statesmen and business managers, who viewed the corporate framework for development as a logical and scientific approach to global progress.²⁶⁷

Corporate optimism about the use of markets to establish economic worth and efficiency was matched with an equal enthusiasm for a rational application of management in strategic affairs. In this regard, the arms control conferences of the 1920s reflected the postwar script for a comprehensive means of avoiding war between the great powers. The careful balance of power written into the naval agreements corresponded with the postwar economic management of war reparations. Charles Dawes, Coolidge's secretary of the treasury, came to the rescue of Europe in 1924 with the restructuring of German war debt. The combined actions of arms control and high-level economic assistance suggested a world of progress under the aegis of Anglo-American economic and political power.²⁶⁸

However, with the sudden collapse of major world economies at the end of the 1920s, the neo-Wilsonian liberal order, so promising in the 1920s, was replaced by the ideological struggles of the 1930s. The rise of National Socialism in Germany and the related extreme nationalist movements in Italy, Spain, Japan, and elsewhere in the world, combined with the Stalinist movement in the Soviet Union, created alternative visions of the West's future. The liberal order of the 1930s had totalitarian ideologies challenging its legitimacy from both the extreme right and the extreme left of the political spectrum. The script for Western and world civilization was being contested by the rival systems and their leaderships. Hitler, Stalin, and the leaders of the liberal West, including, as the

Hody, The Politics of Trade: American Political Development and Foreign Economic Policy (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1996), 77–104.

²⁶⁷*Hody, The Politics of Trade; Iriye, The Globalization of America, 88–102; Hogan, Informal Entente, 78–104; Rosenberg, Financial Missionaries to the World, 187–95; Robert F. Burk, The Corporate State and the Broker State (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 1–65.*

²⁶⁸*Stephen Schuker, The End of French Predominance in Europe: The Financial Crisis of 1924 and the Adoption of the Dawes Plan (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1976), 131–71; Costigliola, Awkward Dominion, 114–26; George Percival, The Dawes Plan and the New Economics (New York: Doubleday, 1928); Roger Dingman, Power in the Pacific: The Origins of Naval Arms Limitation, 1914–1922 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976); Christopher Hall, Britain, America, and Arms Control, 1921–37 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), 1–58; Robert Ferrell, Peace in Their Time: The Origins of the Kellogg-Briand Pact (New York: Norton, 1952); Hogan, Informal Entente, 67–77.*

Second World War began, Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt, vied for power in the technocratic age—an epoch that all understood promised exponential change.²⁶⁹

Postwar Wilsonianism

In a sense, ideologically, the liberal technocratic system of the interwar period began with Woodrow Wilson and ended with him. The start of world war in Europe did not end Wilsonian idealism; rather, it carried forward through the Second World War and beyond. Franklin Roosevelt, who served in Wilson's administration as undersecretary of the Navy, projected his vision.

Like his predecessors and his successors, Woodrow Wilson projected his personality onto American foreign relations. Wilson reflected the essence of American culture and nationality. As Lloyd Ambrosius thoroughly documented in his study of Wilson's foreign policy, he embodied a belief in the redemptive mission of the nation. In his thinking about world affairs, Woodrow Wilson did not distinguish between Americanism and Christianity. They were inseparable elements of the moral philosophy he inscribed in his political thought.²⁷⁰ In his personal script as an American president, he promoted the tenets of an internationalism that challenged political realism as well as the military framework for projecting national power in a hostile world. Despite his antimilitarist doctrines, he won the First World War and was the most eminent and influential global leader at the end of that conflict. Yet, despite his international preeminence, the country had enough of Wilson after he lost the fight for treaty ratification and suffered the stroke that left him irreparably brain damaged. The redeemer nation rejected Wilson's party in the 1920 election, forcing his coalition out of office in a presidential and congressional landslide.²⁷¹ Yet, Wilson's fervent idealism was a genuine reflection of his American culture. Its promise of universal democracy and virtuous peace would take different forms in the rhetoric and substantive policies of national administrations, but Wilson's mission would always be there. There would always be a general orientation toward a redemptive American mission, whether within the United States itself or in the nation's encounters with the world. American historiography, from the early national period to the

²⁶⁹Payne, *A History of Fascism*. Payne views Hitler's ideology and racial views as entirely modern, a product of the Enlightenment (p. 203). Michael Halberstam, *Totalitarianism and the Modern Concept of Politics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 36–55; Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979); Kershaw, *Nemesis*, 3–60; Ian Kershaw, *The "Hitler Myth": Image and Reality in the Third Reich* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 48–82; Robert Conquest, *Stalin: Breaker of Nations* (London: Phoenix Giant, 1998); Ronald Grigor Suny, "Stalin and His Stalinism: Power and Authority in the Soviet Union, 1930–1953," in Ian Kershaw and Moshe Lewin, eds., *Stalinism and Nazism: Dictatorships in Comparison* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 26–52; Michael Mann, "The Contradictions of Continuous Revolution," in *ibid.*, 135–57; Graeme Gill, *The Origins of the Stalinist Political System* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

²⁷⁰Knock, *To End All Wars*, 8–13.

²⁷¹Eugene P. Trani and David L. Wilson, *The Presidency of Warren G. Harding* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1977), 3–10.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

present, has shown that this was the script embedded in American character, reflective of the ideology of the founding Protestant cultures in the earliest years of English North American settlement.²⁷²

Redemption was also embedded, albeit subtly, in the corporate internationalism of the interwar period. Rejecting Wilson's idealism, the Republican presidents of the 1920s followed a foreign policy that emphasized the basic principles of the Wilsonian design. The country sponsored disarmament, pacifist peace treaties, the expansion of international trade, and the refinancing of German war debt. The Republican script wanted American business to expand abroad; it wanted a stable international system built on capitalism and the technological progress of the new scientific and managerial age. Yet, the country, in the 1920s, was in the paradoxical position of sponsoring the creation of the new international system and rejecting its own participation in it. Wilson's expansive internationalist ideology shaped the architecture of the League of Nations.²⁷³ However, with the failure of ratification in the U.S. Senate, the League's future course was then found wanting. How, in a turbulent world, could an international organization maintain order without the power and influence of the most powerful nation?²⁷⁴ The conflict within American culture, interpreted by the Harvard historian Louis Hartz at mid-century, between the insularity and safety of a nationalist isolationism and the country's mission to the world as progenitor of liberal internationalism was unresolved with the end of the First World War. The conflict moved into the new era after the collapse of German, Austrian, and Russian power in Europe with a mixture of traditional American antimilitarism and the business internationalism of a growing cosmopolitan corporate culture. The liberal technocratic script continued its construction of a mirrored world of skyscrapers and ocean liners, steel mills and oil refineries. The script entailed not only building the physical structures for modern times; it was also constructing the epistemic systems, the scientific and technical knowledge, that would work through the engines of capitalism's institutions to create the new culture of the twentieth century. All of this activity, intellectual and physical in nature, was transforming, indeed creating, the "American" century.²⁷⁵

Clearly, the massive European land warfare of the teens had changed the world. In just half a decade, it had moved the cultural, political, and strategic space of Europe onto

²⁷²Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, 783–834; *Knock*, *To End All Wars*, 3–5.

²⁷³John Milton Cooper Jr., *Breaking the Heart of the World: Woodrow Wilson and the Fight for the League of Nations* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 10–54.

²⁷⁴*Ibid.*, 412–33; F. S. Northedge, *The League of Nations: Its Life and Times, 1920–1946* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1986), 278–92; Warren F. Kuehl and Lynne K. Dunn, *Keeping the Covenant: American Internationalists and the League of Nations, 1920–1939* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1997), 64–89.

²⁷⁵Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought since the Revolution* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1955); Henry R. Luce, *The American Century* (New York: Time, 1941); Howard Segal, *Technological Utopianism in American Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 120–55; *Noble*, *America by Design*, 227–354; Ross, *Origins of American Social Science*, 420–58.

a new level, defined more by technocratic concepts of power. Europe and the world were now in a different age that unleashed new forces on the international system. Revolutionary socialism and different forms of its right-wing ideological mirror, fascism, imparted new and terrifying concepts of modernity and modernization. Soon, the new age, which began with the promise of the League of Nations, would face its antitheses in Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, and Stalin. America, the great power of the New World, was now the world's most important country. The nation of Protestant redemption superseded its Old World cousins, Britain, France, and Germany. This new age of industrialism and now postindustrialism suggested that national power was more and more a function of technological—that is, technocratic—knowledge applied to the military and economic spheres. The technocratic came in the form of ideas, such as physics applied to military science, and the mathematical structure of the business system. It also came in the form of new institutions, dedicated to the construction of this new postmonarchy world.²⁷⁶

The end of the First World War and the ensuing war settlement period left a very new organizational environment for international affairs. Ostensibly, it was more stable than the pre-1914 balance-of-power system. Born in the 1920s were new international institutions that together with the burgeoning fields of law and social science gave cosmopolitan leaderships an authentically modern technocratic consciousness. The practice of international relations now combined an increasing body of law with astute concerns for global strategic and economic questions. In the 1920s, the strategic balance of power was examined during disarmament conferences in Washington and London. Further, the economic arrangements for stabilizing and supporting the world economy were negotiated by the great powers with the intention of maintaining a viable system of global development. In a range of areas within international relations, the 1920s represented a genuine professional and utilitarian perspective on international order. From the view of a new managed international system, based upon international law and corporate internationalism, the world had clearly entered a new age. It had departed from the Machiavellian and Metternichian traditions of earlier centuries. Now the nascent

²⁷⁶P. J. P. Millican and A. Clark, eds., *The Legacy of Alan Turing*, 2 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (London: Macmillan, 1936); Sandro Petruccioli, *Atoms, Metaphors, and Paradoxes: Niels Bohr and the Construction of a New Physics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Jagdish Mehra and Helmut Rechenberg, *The Completion of Quantum Mechanics, 1926–1941* (New York: Springer, 2000); John Stachel, *Einstein from “B” to “Z”* (Boston: Birkhauser, 2002); Moy, *War Machines*, 163–77; Mowery and Rosenberg, *Paths of Innovation*; Gordon Bussey, *Wireless: The Crucial Decade: History of the British Wireless Industry, 1924–34* (London: P. Peregrinus, 1990); J. E. Kaufmann and H. W. Kaufmann, *The Sleeping Giant: American Armed Forces between the Wars* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996); Richard Rhodes, ed., *Visions of Technology: A Century of Vital Debate about Machines, Systems, and the Human World* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

liberal internationalism of the 1920s hoped to never revisit the destruction that the last war had brought upon Europe.²⁷⁷

In comparison to traditional great power realism, the neo-Wilsonian perspective on international relations was less Eurocentric and more global. It was less aristocratic and more “scientific” in approach. It was a thoroughly American ideology that marked the world’s and America’s new script. Irrespective of emerging concerns in Asia and Eastern and Central Europe, the technocratic age of the 1920s marked the preeminent ascendancy of the United States as the leader of the global revolution, not only in commerce but also in the intellectual foundations of postmodern technocratic civilization. The new epoch had a dynamic narrative framework that combined all the elements of twentieth-century modernism: technology, science, capitalism, and liberalism. The American narrative involved the development of a unique cosmopolitan technocratic liberalism, represented by the newest American forms of industry and technical invention. These included, principally, mass production technology, mass communications, feats of aviation by Charles Lindbergh, and, in general, the emerging American scientific enterprise, which promised ongoing advances in engineering and the physical sciences. Now, if there was to be an American century, its genesis was clearly in the confluence of American internationalism and the economic and technical achievements of a robust national culture.²⁷⁸

Nonetheless, over the long term, the growth of Americanism in world culture, while beneficial, would not be sufficient to ensure, as Immanuel Kant had proposed in 1795, a “perpetual peace” in the international system. From all points of observation during the

²⁷⁷Shabtai Rosenne, *The Law and Practice of the International Court, 1920–1996*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Kluwer Law, 1997); J. H. Carpentier Altling and W. de Cock Buning, *The Effect of the War upon the Colonies* (New Haven, CT: Carnegie Endowment, 1928); *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Economic and Social History of the World War* (New Haven, CT: Carnegie Endowment, 1926); *League of Nations, Armaments Truce* (Geneva: League of Nations, 1931); *League of Nations, Conference for the Limitation of Naval Armaments* (Geneva: League of Nations, 1927); John Maurer, “Arms Control and the Washington Conference,” in Erik Goldstein and John Maurer, eds., *The Washington Conference, 1921–22: Naval Rivalry, East Asian Stability and the Road to Pearl Harbor* (Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1994), 267–93; *Conference on the Limitation of Armament: Washington, November 12, 1921–February 6, 1922* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1922); Hall, *Britain, America, and Arms Control, 193–218*; Akira Iriye, *After Imperialism: The Search for a New Order in the Far East, 1921–1931* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 13–21.

²⁷⁸Rosenberg, *Financial Missionaries to the World*, 151–218; Ellis W. Hawley, “Herbert Hoover, the Commerce Secretariat and the Vision of an ‘Associative State,’ 1921–1928,” in Himmelberg, *Business-Government Cooperation*, 150–74; Derek H. Aldcroft, *From Versailles to Wall Street, 1919–1929* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 97–155, 187–216; Andre Siegfried, *America Comes of Age: A French Analysis* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1927); Denny Ludwell, *America Conquers Britain: A Record of Economic War* (New York: Knopf, 1930); Paul Mazur, *American Prosperity: Its Causes and Consequences* (New York: Viking, 1928); Robert Sobel, *The Age of Giant Corporations: A Microeconomic History of American Business, 1914–1992* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993), 25–51.

1920s, there were apparent structural deficiencies built into the interwar system that presaged its collapse.²⁷⁹ The political world beyond America was far too complex and full of nuance to obey simple formulas. In the aftermath of the destabilizing effects of the First World War, the world was more divided and open to change. The multiplicity of demographic, ethnocultural, and socioeconomic conditions, along with historical rivalries affecting the world's many regions, predicted political divisions rather than American-style stability and homogeneity.²⁸⁰ Europe was just barely able to feed itself and had to rely on American food aid to prevent famine. In light of all of these difficulties, the new civic virtues of democracy were extremely fragile everywhere. The colonial regions now simmered with anti-imperial sentiments encouraged by the ideology of Woodrow Wilson. Indian, Arab, African, and East Asian nationalists demanded national sovereignty, while the European mother countries, still convinced of imperialism's benefits, were oblivious.²⁸¹ As the Great War had taught the world, the apotheosis of the West and the advent of a liberal technocratic age in the twentieth century also burned with tragedy. In those tragedies lay the seeds of the brutal narratives of the 1930s and 1940s, in which mass deaths from famines, executions, and warfare reorganized the international system and redefined the technocratic age. How difficult keeping the peace would be was not apparent in the first decade after the war. International arms control and public finance controlled by the United States attempted to stabilize the international system and promote the market and the rule of law. As soon as the Great Depression hit, a decade after Versailles, it was clear to all rational observers that what had been planned for international peace and global development was lacking in every respect.²⁸²

In the immediate postwar period, the most salient counternarratives for European culture were the movements toward revolutionary socialism. The 1920s were not only a time for the implementation of corporate capitalism and mass production technologies in

²⁷⁹Thomas E. Hall and J. David Ferguson, *The Great Depression: An International Disaster of Perverse Economic Policies* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), 31–90; Mark Wheeler, ed., *The Economics of the Great Depression* (Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1998); Dietmar Rothermund, *The Global Impact of the Great Depression* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 1–58.

²⁸⁰Frank H. Simonds, *Can Europe Keep the Peace?* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1931); Peter Drucker, *End of Economic Man: A Study of the New Totalitarianism* (New York: John Day, 1939); Richard Lamb, *The Drift to War, 1922–1939* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991); Sontag, *A Broken World*; David Clay, *Between Two Fires: Europe's Path in the 1930s* (New York: Norton, 1990); Stephen J. Lee, *The European Dictatorships 1918–1945* (London: Routledge, 1988).

²⁸¹John Callaghan, *Great Power Complex: British Imperialism, International Crises, and National Decline, 1914–51* (London: Pluto Press, 1997); Rudolf von Albertini, *European Colonial Rule, 1880–1940: The Impact of the West on India, Southeast Asia, and Africa* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 488–514; Shashi Joshi, *Struggle for Hegemony in India, 1920–47: The Colonial State, the Left and the National Movement*, 3 vols. (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992–1994).

²⁸²Sontag, *A Broken World*, 236–350; Lamb, *The Drift to War*, 69–192; Clay, *Between Two Fires*, 23–136.

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

manufacturing. In international history, they were also the period for the practical implementation of socialism, based upon the radical social science of Karl Marx and his legions of intellectual and political heirs. Revolutionary socialists were active all over Europe as well as spreading the gospel throughout the colonial world, as the imperial systems of the prewar era showed no signs of establishing genuine independence for their captive subjects. The drive to overthrow capitalism in all its forms had gained currency in most areas of Europe, but far and away the most important event had occurred in Russia. The 1920s were indeed the founding era for the world's first revolutionary socialist state, the Soviet Union. Soviet communism, developed by Lenin and his subordinates in the Communist Party, was an attempt at building the "scientific socialism" espoused by Marx and Marxist theoreticians.²⁸³

In the works of Lenin, who contributed his theory of imperialism to international communist doctrine, revolutionary socialism had an ideology that countered, at the most elemental level, the legitimacy of the liberal technocratic order. In a real sense, it was the counterscript to the West's millenarian belief in the power of the market. By doctrine and institutional fiat, it rejected in total the idea of agency afforded individuals in a market society. It found in capitalism a global system of imperialism that was destined for destruction. An ideological schism developed between the liberals in Europe and North America, who defended and championed the market and parliamentary rule, and the believers in the new socialist state, who proposed to restructure industrialism by eliminating private ownership and adopting centralized (and quite autocratic) planning. In retrospect, the Leninist and later Stalinist concept of the state did not immediately challenge the liberal order. However, revolutionary socialism appeared to be quite dangerous to contemporary observers. Its growing presence and ruthlessness established itself between the liberal order on the one hand and the emerging right-wing totalitarian movements on the other.²⁸⁴

The fierce antagonism between liberal capitalism and Marxism-Leninism reverberated from the Bolshevik Revolution through more than seven decades of world history. Ideologies mirrored intertwined scripts, national and multinational, that defined the long Cold War from 1917 through 1990. The institutional and cultural systems of capitalism

²⁸³*August Bebel, Society of the Future (Moscow: Progress, 1971); Charles H. Vail, The Principles of Scientific Socialism (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1906); Ulam, The Bolsheviks, 449–514; Nikolai Bukharin, The ABC of Communism: A Popular Explanation of the Program of the Communist Party of Russia (London: Communist Party of Great Britain, 1922); Maxim Litvinoff, The Bolshevik Revolution: Its Rise and Meaning (Chicago: Socialist Party of the United States, 1920); William T. Goode, Bolshevism at Work (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920); Ryder, The German Revolution of 1918, 88–236; Friedlander, The German Revolution of 1918. The seeds of Chinese communism were planted by Lenin. See Alexander Pantsov, The Bolsheviks and the Chinese Revolution, 1919–1927 (Richmond, VA: Curzon, 2000), 41–69.*

²⁸⁴*Lenin, The State and Revolution; V. I. Lenin, The Experience of the CPSU: Its World Significance (Moscow: Progress, 1975); Lenin, Imperialism; V. I. Lenin, The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1951); Arendt, Origins of Totalitarianism, 305–88.*

and Soviet-style socialism opposed one another, denigrating each other's existence through the 1920s and the Great Depression. Then, during the Second World War, a historical moment of alliance against the Nazi war machine inspired effective coalition warfare by the two rivals. Yet, after the brief period of alliance against Nazism, they were dangerous adversaries once again through decades of postmodern development. Through the Korean and Vietnam wars, the arms race, and the multitude of other conflicts between capitalist and Marxist countries that characterized the Cold War, the liberal and the communist camps were connected in the global metascript. The rivalry between these two ideologies, and their corresponding scripts, was engendered by the genuine transnational political (class) alignments of the technocratic age.²⁸⁵

The class divisions institutionalized in the political systems of liberal democracies existed prior to the Great War and the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. They also existed after the destruction of the old order in Europe and the introduction of the postwar Wilsonian system of the 1920s. Around the globe propertied and professional classes were aligned against the political and economic interests of labor. In the technocratic era, with the Russian revolution, seedbeds for aggressive labor radicalism spread throughout the international system. The international communist movement promised to foment challenges to the liberal order in both the imperial home countries of the West and their colonial empires. The new institution for international order, namely, the League of Nations, tempered all of this. Neo-Wilsonians everywhere hoped that the prosperity and freedom of liberalism would surmount Leninism. They hoped that the challenges posed by revolutionary socialism would be overcome by enlightened leaderships who would not abandon their countries to communist doctrine for the liberation of colonial peoples. The challenges posed by Lenin and the Communist Party of the newly formed Soviet Union gathered credibility over time. From the left perspective, the postwar international system not only threatened the continuation of widespread poverty and political disenfranchisement in the colonies. It also promoted the consolidation of American and European capital in the liberal West's drive to perpetuate capitalist hegemony. The only solution then, from the point of view of the left, was the overthrow of capitalism and the liberal bourgeois order. In itself, this systemic ideological rejection of the liberal establishment was nothing new. Now, however, the presence of a huge communist state in Europe suggested the likelihood of its expansion through legal and extralegal means in

²⁸⁵For modern socialists, the division of the world under contemporary capitalism remains thoroughly transparent. See, for example, Jeffrey Frieden and David A. Lake, eds., *International Political Economy: Perspectives on Global Power and Wealth* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995); Randall Germain, ed., *Globalization and Its Critics: Perspectives from Political Economy* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000); Inga Brandell, ed., *Workers in Third World Industrialization* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1991); Steffan Lindberg and Arni Sverrisson, eds., *Social Movements in Development: The Challenge of Globalization and Democratization* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

all areas of the world. From the perspective of liberals and the defenders of the liberal international order, the left was a dangerous adversary.²⁸⁶

The threat of international communism, however, was not the whole story. The fragmenting ideological currents of the new age were strong and growing stronger with each passing year. Interwar European political ideology included a third international movement, centered in Germany and Italy, which fell under the rubric of Mussolini's terms "fascism" and "totalitarianism." The totalitarian movements of the right juxtaposed themselves against both the totalitarian movements on the left and the neoclassical liberal order in the center. The destruction of four European empires and the universal impact of the brutal conflict on world civilization created a vacuum in the international system. As the first decade after the Great War progressed, a new script, a product of extreme nationalism, began to emerge for the West and indeed the entire international community. Fascism and communism, products of the twentieth century and the struggle for control over European and non-European societies, were formidable organizational weapons. Aligned against one another, using nationalistic and historical arguments as well as "scientific" ones, the harbingers of repression, war, genocide, and technocratic destruction challenged the precepts of a parliamentary world of cosmopolitan culture and industrial capitalism.²⁸⁷

With the Great Depression, the nascent script for world war became clear. There would be an ideological and, ultimately, a military conflict, involving the competing ideologies of the technocratic age. The metascript for the 1930s and then the Second World War centered on the confluence of three distinct and opposing spheres of political ideology. They were fascism, broadly defined; liberalism, also broadly understood; and international communism, inclusive of Stalinism and Stalinist groups everywhere. Each of these political camps, though divided by internal differences over ideology and national interests, feared and loathed the others. The material stakes behind the rivalries were clear. Over the next quarter of a century these three transnational ideological systems, representing three divergent paths of modernization, competed against one another for control of the international system. The dominance of liberalism appeared certain only in the 1920s. Within just a few years, the optimistic age of American jazz, the "It Girl," and corporate internationalism was replaced by the related international crises of global depression and world war.

²⁸⁶Gregory M. Luebbert, *Liberalism, Fascism, or Social Democracy: Social Classes and the Political Origins of Regimes in Interwar Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 191–312; Sternhell, *The Birth of Fascist Ideology*, 195–258; Martin Blinkhorn, ed., *Fascists and Conservatives: The Radical Right and the Establishment in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990).

²⁸⁷Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 188–230; Kershaw, *Hubris*, 501–26. See essays in Ian Kershaw and Moshe Lewin, eds., *Stalinism and Nazism: Dictatorships in Comparison* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 26–157; Phillip Zelnick, *The Organizational Weapon: A Study of Bolshevik Strategy and Tactics* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1960).

Within a decade and a half, there were the traumas of the global economic crisis and the horrific destruction of the Second World War. The interwar system faced the insurgence of Nazi Germany in Europe and imperial Japan in the Far East, and liberalism shook. In the absence of an effective script for the management of the international system in the face of the Great Depression, the grotesque and thoroughly dangerous totalitarian movements of the far right waged war against the liberal metascript. Had Britain not been able to hold against the Nazi assault in 1940, the future course of Europe and a considerable part of the world would have been much different. Instead of a postwar Europe dominated by liberalism, perhaps Europe would have seen its integration into the genocidal structure of the Third Reich and the Japanese empire.²⁸⁸

In the aftermath of the Great War, the West's metascript was poised at a critical historical moment. Guided by ideology and nationalist creeds, the international system had begun to divide between different visions of modernity. Several distinct paths toward that modernity had produced opposing institutional arrangements and forms of national culture. Now these paths were powerful rivals for global supremacy. In the ensuing complex interplay between these separate forms of Western modernization, the metascript had to juxtapose its most sublime achievements, humanism and scientific knowledge and the rule of law, with its most pathological and dangerous ideologies. The National Socialist regime in Germany and the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union shared the same intellectual heritage as the liberal states of Western Europe and North America. The legacies of Greece, Rome, the Renaissance, and the Enlightenment and the scientific, political, and commercial revolutions of the contemporary West were claimed, albeit differently, by totalitarian and liberal regimes alike. The metascript formed a circle of crisis between the opposing nation-states, forcing the fate of the West's civilization upon the national actors who faced each other at the end of the interwar years and during the Second World War.

The world economic crisis created the conditions for the ideological competition, the script that posed liberalism against fascism and communism, and the two forms of totalitarianism against one another and the liberal world. To observers from every segment of the ideological spectrum, the question of global rivalry was assumed. Around

²⁸⁸Aly Gotz, "Final Solution": Nazi Population Policy and the Murder of the European Jews (*New York: Oxford University Press, 1999*), 245–60. By 1940 the Nazi race hierarchy divided the German population into four groups. The lowest group was deemed "unworthy of state aid." At the same time, Jews, Gypsies, and a large number of Slavs were marked for extermination. See Norman Lerner, *Final Solutions: Biology, Prejudice and Genocide* (*University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1992*); George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (*New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1964*), 88–107; Glaser, *The Cultural Roots of National Socialism*, 136–62, 294–317; Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, 3 vols. (*New York: Holmes & Meier, 1985*); Omer Bartov, *Mirrors of Destruction: War, Genocide and Modern Identity* (*New York: Oxford, 2000*). In many respects, Japanese war atrocities not only equaled but exceeded Nazi war crimes in some areas. See Yuki Tanaka, *Hidden Horrors: Japanese War Crimes in World War II* (*Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996*); Iris Chang, *The Rape of Nanking: The Forgotten Holocaust of WWII* (*New York: Basic Books, 1997*).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

the world, communist and socialist parties viewed the Soviet Union as the superior system for advancing the interests of the masses, both in the developed and the colonial regions. For right-wing authoritarian and fascist parties, the anticommunist and antiliberal ideologies of Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco, to name the most prominent, represented the wave of the future. In this context, the liberal regimes—both the progressive and democratic socialism found in Europe and the more conservative liberalism that existed in the United States—maintained a faith in liberal internationalist principles, even as the treaties that framed the rule of law were discarded one by one through the 1930s. In the wake of large-scale poverty and economic collapse, the new totalitarian forms of the nation-state promised prosperity. American internationalism imploded in the early 1930s as the country struggled with the survival of its institutions in the face of the Great Depression. With diffidence, Great Britain and France watched German totalitarianism rise in Central Europe, while they coped with the effects of world depression at home and in their vast imperial possessions. The contest, which quickened with each year of the 1930s, was for nothing less than global hegemony.²⁸⁹

Liberalism had expressed itself in the national identities of many countries, including some—most importantly Germany—that converted quickly to fascism in the 1930s. Fascism, centered in the powers of Germany, Japan, and Italy, defined an antiliberal form of radical nationalism and socialism in which the individual was subsumed under the racial mythology of the nation. In Marxism-Leninism, the same response to liberalism was expressed in the totalitarian doctrine of the revolutionary state, where, under Stalin, the masses were mobilized to serve the party. The Jacobin tradition of the French Revolution had not disappeared with Napoleon but was reborn in the stiff and merciless repression that characterized the totalitarian systems that matured in the 1930s. The brief decade of respite, the 1920s, which witnessed the “peace ideology” of Wilsonian ideas

²⁸⁹ Donald Cameron Watt, *How War Came: The Immediate Origins of the Second World War, 1938–1939* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989); Arnold Offner, *American Appeasement: United States Foreign Policy and Germany, 1933–1938* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939); Peijian Shen, *The Age of Appeasement: The Evolution of British Foreign Policy in the 1930s* (Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1999); R. A. C. Parker, *Chamberlain and Appeasement: British Policy and the Coming of the Second World War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993); Christopher Hill, *Cabinet Decisions on Foreign Policy: The British Experience, October 1938–June 1941* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Anthony Eden, *Foreign Affairs* (London: Faber & Faber, 1939); Maurice Cowling, *The Impact of Hitler: British Politics and British Policy, 1933–1940* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975); Andrew Thorpe, *The British Communist Party and Moscow, 1920–1943* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000); William Fortescue, *The Third Republic in France, 1870–1940: Conflicts and Continuities* (New York: Routledge, 2000); Bernard, *The Decline of the Third Republic*; Robert Stuart, *Marxism at Work: Ideology, Class, and French Socialism during the Third Republic* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Joel Coulton, Leon Blum: *Humanist in Politics* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987); Piotr S. Wandycz, *The Twilight of French Eastern Alliances, 1926–1936: French-Czechoslovak-Polish Relations from Locarno to the Remilitarization of the Rhineland* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 259–478.

crafted into substantive international law by the great powers and the League of Nations, did not prevent the emergence of fascism as a global phenomenon. Nor did the business internationalism of large American corporations and international economic regimes to support global commerce and economic development prevent the irredentist and expansionist designs of European and Asian fascism.²⁹⁰

In this context, the technocratic epistemologies of science and industrial technology became both methods and weapons of modernization. Knowledge systems developed to support the political and strategic objectives of competing nation-states. Military technologies advanced as the major nation-states prepared for the next war. By the late 1930s, science and scientists were being mobilized for war. Revolutionary advances in physics made by European scientists in the fields of relativity and quantum mechanics were being applied to possible military use for the development of nuclear fission weapons. Faster military aircraft, bombers, tanks, radar, and advanced radio communication systems all were engineered in the service of national defense systems. Ironically, the epistemologies of industrial-era war were fashioned by the same state institutions that promoted the new diplomacy of internationalism. In a sense, the period between the wars represented not only a clash of transnational and national scripts, but also a global schizophrenia in which the pursuit of militarism and pacifism intersected, sometimes within the same international crisis and nation-state. It was a time of “progress” and also one of near catastrophic economic and political crisis. Its end was not a diminution of the crises but their explosion in the most destructive war in human history.²⁹¹

²⁹⁰Glaser, *The Cultural Roots of National Socialism*; Roderick Stackelberg, *Hitler's Germany: Origins, Interpretations, Legacies* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Erich Voegelin, *Hitler and the Germans* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999); Martyn Housden, *Helmut Nicolai and Nazi Ideology* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1992); Catrine Clay and Michael Leapman, *Master Race: The Lebensborn Experiment in Nazi Germany* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1995); Griffin, *Fascism*; E. L. Carsten, *The Rise of Fascism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980); Detlef Muhlberger, ed., *The Social Basis of European Fascist Movements* (New York: Croom Helm, 1987); William Miles Fletcher III, *The Search for a New Order: Intellectuals and Fascism in Prewar Japan* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); Paul Brooker, *The Faces of Fraternalism: Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Imperial Japan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); David Bergamini, *Japan's Imperial Conspiracy* (New York: Morrow, 1971); Germaine A. Hoston, *Marxism and the Crisis of Development in Prewar Japan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986); Eiko Ikegami, *The Taming of the Samurai: Honorific Individualism and the Making of Modern Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995); Leonard A. Humphreys, *The Way of the Heavenly Sword: The Japanese Army in the 1920's* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), 108–26, 175. *Japanese war crimes included the widespread practice of cannibalism in the South Pacific; see Tanaka, Hidden Horrors, 111–34. Cannibalism of prisoners of war and civilians by Japanese soldiers in these areas of severe food shortage was common practice. Further, biological warfare experiments and mass killings typified Japanese atrocities in China; Tanaka, Hidden Horrors, 135–96.*

²⁹¹Apparently, Germany's chief nuclear physicist, Werner Heisenberg, doubted the practicality of a uranium-based nuclear weapon. See Paul Lawrence Rose, *Heisenberg and the Nazi Atomic*

Interwar Isolationism and Corporate Internationalism

As soon as the First World War ended in Europe, public opinion in the West wanted no more to do with that kind of conflict. The maiming and death of millions of young men and the desolation of civil society in the battle areas scarred an entire generation. Postwar societies in the major combatant countries had to come to terms with the huge losses of an entire age cohort (mainly young) soldiers... The human costs of the war were more profound, more destructive, in a shorter period of time, than in any previous ones in modern European history. The idea of human progress, as the historiography of the war's social and cultural impact so strongly suggests, was shattered. The English poet T. S. Eliot's famous poem "The Wasteland" described the pathos of the "lost generation." The collective memory of the war changed the tone of contemporary life in Europe and North America. From the buoyant optimism found in American, British, French, and other Western cultures prior to the war, the morbidity and sheer destruction of the conflict provided a new view of modern civilization, marked as much by evil as by prosperity and freedom. The sense of a material and abiding evil in human affairs, along with the impermanence and desolation, was, of course, a prelude to the 1930s. It was also a prediction of the return to world war that the 1940s would bring to hand. In short, the interwar period was an extremely brief period of order and prosperity. For less than a decade, from the early to the late 1920s, the world overall had a modicum of economic growth and political order. A democratic state existed in Germany, Japan had not succumbed to a military regime, and the Soviets had not yet launched the massive purges, executions, and forced resettlements that characterized Stalin's regime from the 1930s onward.

In the United States, the political revulsion over the horrible human cost of the First World War was extreme enough to keep American soldiers out of Europe until the third year of the Second World War. Then the nation went to war only after the Japanese surprise attack at Pearl Harbor and the declarations of war by Japan, Germany, and Italy.

Bomb Project: A Study in German Culture (*Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998*); Thomas Powers, *Heisenberg's War: The Secret History of the German Bomb* (*New York: Penguin Books, 1994*). A revisionist interpretation of the Nazi atomic bomb project is found in Philip Henshall, *The Nuclear Axis: Germany, Japan and the Atom Bomb Race, 1939–1945* (*Stroud, UK: Sutton, 2000*). Henshall believes the evidence suggests that Germany was much closer to building a serviceable weapon than other analyses have shown. See also Monika Renneberg and Mark Walker, eds., *Science, Technology, and National Socialism* (*New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994*). *The Third Reich sponsored both normal and pseudoscientific disciplines. All were oriented toward support of National Socialism. Nazi science served military needs and economic autarky as well as industrial genocide. See Margit Szollosi-Janze, ed., Science in the Third Reich* (*New York: Oxford University Press, 2001*); Dieter Holsken, *V-Missiles of the Third Reich: The V-1 and V-2* (*Sturbridge, MA: Monogram Aviation, 1994*); Edward J. Drea, *In the Service of the Emperor: Essays on the Imperial Japanese Army* (*Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998*), 26–74; Meirion Harries, *Soldiers of the Sun: The Rise and Fall of the Imperial Japanese Army* (*New York: Random House, 1991*).

Despite the international prestige attached to military preparedness, the postwar American military was grossly undermanned and underfunded. It was as if the strategic interests of the United States stopped at the water's edge. The military's funding dropped to the miserable levels historically afforded to the peacetime military in the United States. In France and Great Britain, the possibility of another war was a chilling prospect that those nations would avoid to the last moment. Nonetheless, the interwar period was just that. It was a twenty-year period of cold peace in Europe.

The Germans never accepted the war settlement imposed upon them by the Allies. For two decades the Germans rearmed. In the Weimar period, the armament was by subterfuge. The German government found novel legalistic detours around some of Versailles' stringent conditions. Limited to an army of one hundred thousand men, the Germans rotated draftees through the ranks, keeping an officer corps of close to the maximum troop level on active duty. Military cooperation between the German democracy and the Soviet Union allowed for advanced weapons research and development in tanks and aircraft—both strictly controlled by the Versailles Treaty. When the Weimar Republic ended with the election of Adolf Hitler in 1933, the German military establishment was poised for large-scale reconstruction. In the space of six years, the Nazi regime mobilized Germany for an expansionist war. Prussian militarism, so defining of German national culture during the Wilhelminian period, returned quickly and easily. When the country launched its war against the West in 1939, and then the Soviet Union in 1941, it had no trouble building a huge land army and formidable air force to destroy its adversaries.²⁹²

How deep a paradox it was for a world community that embraced Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points to disintegrate in the space of just a few years, and from the late 1920s to the early 1930s to fall into a demonic period of repression and preparation for total war. So clearly did the liberal technocratic order dissolve in the 1930s that the nature of the evils facing the West were accepted as mere fact. Fascism in different national forms faced its twin adversaries with the confidence that the more powerful liberal regimes, notably the United States and Great Britain, would do nothing but appease them. The antithesis of the liberal world of individualism, democracy, and the rule of law was found in the jackbooted columns of the SS and the stiff, one-armed salutes of fascists in Germany, Italy, Spain, and elsewhere. Fascist ideologies celebrated racism, militarism, and the inviolability of the nation and the state. In the wake of the global rise of fascist ideology, and especially the formidable machine of National Socialism in Germany, the liberal internationalist nations needed to respond quickly and aggressively. However, as the narrative of the origins of the Second World War attests, the great powers of Western Europe—Great Britain and France—whose major instrument for collective security was the League of Nations, failed to respond to the strategic threat other than to appease it.

²⁹²Bernhard R. Kroener, *Organization and Mobilization of the German Sphere of Power* (New York: Clarendon, 2000); Bennett, *German Rearmament and the West*; Wilhelm Deist, "The Rearmament of the Wehrmacht," in Wilhelm Deist et al., *Germany and the Second World War*, vol. 1, *The Build-up of German Aggression* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 373–540.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Nor did the United States respond in a timely and decisive manner; after all, it was a country that embraced internationalism and rejected it simultaneously.²⁹³

In the face of insurgent antidemocratic, totalitarian movements on the right and the left, the 1930s were a catastrophe for the age of liberalism. Lacking the cohesion of formal collective security arrangements ready to move against adversarial states, multilateral security remained a chimera. Without a coherent, collective political will to oppose its expansionist enemies, liberal Western civilization faced its possible defeat and overthrow.

Despite the gravity of the threat posed by Hitler and his empire of National Socialists, British, French, and other Western European powers and the United States were still enamored of avoiding war at all costs. The interests of the liberal and social democratic world of Europe and North America were focused less on preparing for total war against Nazism than on increasingly desperate formulas to find a way, truly any way, to prevent another world war. There was no enthusiasm for fighting the Nazis for Europe when such a war would be as horrific, or more so, than the Great War. The last major war had been fought for reasons that in hindsight were hardly justified when the costs and benefits of it were compared. Deadly trench warfare had killed millions, and one could predict quite readily that a new war would be more destructive. From the perspective of the middle and late 1930s, a new war would be even more senseless as a political instrument for curing the world of totalitarianism and militarism. Not only would a war with a revamped fascist Germany be undesirable; the whole constellation of deterrence and power politics was unfeasible to the old colonial empires. It seemed impossible, the British high command thought in the late 1930s, that Britain, with its limited resources of capital, manpower, and raw materials, could fight an effective war against imperial Japan in the western Pacific while also waging war against a rearmed and irredentist German nation on the continent of Europe. The alternative to waging all-out war, so leading British strategists thought near the eve of Munich, was to somehow maintain the peace. With peace, the world could cope with Nazism through trade and the building of a coherent line of defense against possible assault by the German armies.²⁹⁴

The Great Depression placed the global market economy under severe challenge. Indeed, the magnitude of the economic disaster left the ideology of capitalism fighting for

²⁹³Offner, *American Appeasement*, 18–76; Thomas Guinsberg, *The Pursuit of Isolationism in the United States Senate from Versailles to Pearl Harbor* (New York: Garland, 1982); Manfred Jonas, *Isolationism in America, 1935–1941* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966), 100–35; Iriye, *The Globalization of America*, 131–69; Casey, *Cautious Crusade*, 3–45; Robert A. Divine, *The Illusion of Neutrality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962); Theodore Dreiser, *Is America Worth Saving?* (New York: Modern Age Books, 1941).

²⁹⁴Watt, *How War Came*, 76–187; Offner, *American Appeasement*, 214–80; Peter Neville, *Appeasing Hitler: The Diplomacy of Sir Neville Henderson, 1937–1939* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000); Richard Davis, *Anglo-French Relations before the Second World War: Appeasement and Crisis* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 125–99; B. J. C. McKercher and Roch Legault, eds., *Military Planning and the Origins of the Second World War in Europe* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001).

survival. Around the world, democratic socialists, communists, and fascists proposed radical alternatives to the neoclassical liberal model. The most desirable path of modernization was not a settled matter in an international system dominated by a number of very separate views of political economy and civil society. Everywhere in the world, save North America, democracy was threatened by totalitarian and authoritarian regimes. The liberal script for the international system, inaugurated with the diplomacy at Versailles and confirmed by later conferences in London and Washington, was impotent in the face of the onslaught of antiliberal regimes in the early 1930s. Despite the energy and commitment of liberal internationalists around the world, the institutional mechanisms for global liberal technocratic control were not sufficiently developed to preserve peace in the face of Nazi Germany, fascist Italy, and imperial Japan. After Versailles and the failure of Wilson to ratify membership in the League of Nations, there was no military alliance system, permanent or otherwise, to unite the United States with Western Europe. The atrophy of Western power coincided with the progressive vision of arms control and demilitarization. Throughout the post–World War I era, the military preparedness of the Western powers declined. When the Germans began a massive remilitarization in the mid-1930s, the defense budget of the United States was a little over \$900 million. This was hardly enough to modernize the aging American fleet, its obsolescent tanks, and diminutive air force.²⁹⁵

The Great Depression

The fall of the New York stock market in October 1929 and a chain of related events in world economic history led directly to the global economic crisis. It also launched the essential political conditions for the election of Adolf Hitler as chancellor of the Republic of Germany. It also led directly to the resurgence of Japanese imperialism and fascist models of modernity in Italy, Spain, and around the world. Clearly, the world economic crisis of the Great Depression was the trigger that demolished the fragile political entente of the 1920s and led the world to fascism. The crisis occurred mainly because of the lack of institutional regimes to prevent it. Industrial capitalism had harnessed levels of labor, capital, and resources far greater than in previous historical periods. The vast and expanding industrialism of the great powers, led by the preponderant economic output of the United States, lacked the mature public administrative and regulatory controls to avoid catastrophic systemic collapse. Without a protocol to absorb losses on the world's integrated financial and product markets, the fate of the interwar economy was sealed. The limits of technocratic knowledge were reached when international trade, agriculture, finance, and other sectors of the U.S. economy experienced structural collapse.²⁹⁶

²⁹⁵U.S. Department of Commerce, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1949* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1949), 328. *America's wartime military expenditures peaked at \$80 billion in 1945.*

²⁹⁶Charles Kindleberger, *The World in Depression, 1929–1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); Ben S. Bernanke, ed., *Essays on the Great Depression* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 3–160; Michael Bernstein, *The Great Depression: Delayed*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

What began as a deep business cycle correction quickly turned into global crisis. Lacking the prescience of mature technocratic economic science, which later in the century would provide effective public policy, a series of economic equilibrium upsets in the late 1920s and early 1930s deeply affected the advanced industrial economies of the West. In the space of months, the most severe economic crisis of the industrial age gripped not only the United States, but also, far more ominously, the regional market economies of Europe and East Asia. The economic devastation brought on by the global depression naturally triggered the adaptive mechanisms of national scripts. Adaptation, however, was often unpalatable. The rise of dictators to reestablish order from chaos and to reassure the wealthy from fear of the poor and the dispossessed was often a harsh form of security. The need for security against the possibilities of violent revolution mobilized totalitarian movements on the right in Europe and Latin America. It was a rejection of liberalism, although not a rejection of the technocratic. The same was true on the left, which found its enemy not only in liberalism but also in fascism.²⁹⁷

The global political script in the 1930s was for the rise of totalitarian movements on every continent. Germany's adaptive behavior led it directly into a national election with the ideological extremists of both the far right and the far left. Germany's choice of National Socialism and Adolf Hitler transformed the politics of Europe, literally overnight. Likewise, the Japanese reoriented themselves in 1930, the civilian government succumbing to a military coup, which led immediately to a new policy of aggressive expansion in East Asia. Japan challenged its neighboring Asian societies and the strength and resolve of European and American power in the Far East. The wave of synchronous economic and political events in the early and mid-1930s showed a global narrative at work. The Western metascript had triggered the denouement of liberalism in Central Europe and in East Asia. It would fall to the ingenuity of the international liberal order to defeat its treacherous enemy on the right and hold its enemy but potential ally (the Soviets) on the left.

American Scripts

The heterogeneity of American society was apparent in the interwar period. Beginning with the Palmer raids of 1919, and including the revival and rise of the Ku Klux Klan and the National Origins Act of 1924, the country had to come to terms with the complex ethnocultural politics that now defined the nation. Beginning with the Great Depression, ethnicity and race were quickly superseded as barometers of political tension

Recovery and Economic Change in America, 1929–1939 (*Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987*).

²⁹⁷Harold James, *The End of Globalization: Lessons from the Great Depression* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001); Jurgen von Kruegener, ed., *Economic Crisis and Political Collapse: The Weimar Republic, 1924–1933* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Julian Jackson, *The Politics of Depression in France, 1932–1936* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Blinkhorn, *Fascists and Conservatives*, 71–237; Hans Mommsen, *The Rise and Fall of Weimar Democracy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 318–98.

by issues related to economic class. Internationally, the world system fell into virtual anarchy by the mid-1930s, as fascist armies overran countries in Europe, Africa, and Asia. The United States continued to understand itself as a redeeming civilization, yet that redemption was imagined as an internal quest. The interwar period found the United States struggling with domestic and international issues of extraordinary circumstance. The political dynamics of the country, divided by intricate group interests, imposed a variety of scripts upon American behavior.

There was the corporate script of the 1920s, in which the expansion and efficiency of American industry was represented by the new mass production technology of the automobile industry and the scientific management approaches pioneered by Frederick Taylor. A buoyant international trade in the decade promoted the corporate ideology of expanding markets and efficient labor, with the government's role seen as simply a servant to the master of the market system. After all, it was Calvin Coolidge, shy and taciturn conservative, who was most famous for saying, "The business of America is business." Presidents Warren Harding and Herbert Hoover evoked similar ideas. Their steady conservative administrations promised low taxes and a peaceful international system that would protect the nation from the severe economic burdens of modern warfare. Through American financing and the productivity engendered by the new industrial systems of the technocratic age, they hoped to maintain the modern corporate paradigm as the path to the American future.²⁹⁸

The New Deal script of the 1930s was a response to the deepest of economic crises, improvising a new progressive institutional structure for the American state. Then, the isolationist script in foreign policy forced the country away from intervention, preventing Franklin Roosevelt from intervening against Germany or Japan until the attack against Pearl Harbor. Roosevelt and his circle of advisers embraced the neo-Wilsonian and the

²⁹⁸Robert Ferrell, *The Presidency of Calvin Coolidge* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998), 61–80, 167–89; Richard Norton Smith, *An Uncommon Man: The Triumph of Herbert Hoover* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984), 103–31; Martin L. Fausold, *The Presidency of Herbert C. Hoover* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1985), 105–24; Kendrick Clements, *Hoover, Conservation, and Consumerism: Engineering the Good Life* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000); Thomas K. McCraw, ed., *The Essential Alfred Chandler: Essays toward a Historical Theory of Big Business* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1991); Alfred D. Chandler Jr., *The Coming of Managerial Capitalism: A Casebook on the History of American Economic Institutions* (Homewood, IL: R. D. Irwin, 1985), 396–423, 460–83; Hawley, "Herbert Hoover, the Commerce Secretariat and the Vision of the 'Associative State,' 1921–1928" and "Three Facets of Hooverian Associationalism: Lumber, Aviation and Movies, 1921–1930," in Himmelberg, *Business-Government Cooperation*, 213–41; Morton Keller, *Regulating a New Economy: Public Policy and Economic Change in America, 1900–1933* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990); Patrick D. Reagan, *Designing a New America: The Origins of New Deal Planning, 1890–1943* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 88–139. Reagan clearly sees the corporate paradigm linking Democratic and Republican administrations from the 1890s to the Second World War and shows the institutional dichotomy between Hoover and Roosevelt to be historically false.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

corporate internationalist scripts, but these scripts remained recessive through the balance of the interwar period, until the progress of Hitler made their activation inevitable.

In addition to political scripts there were social ones. There were scripts for desperation on the streets, as the Great Depression drove millions to the point of abject hopelessness. There were scripts for mass protest and union organizing, just as there were narratives for the far right with its Klan and German Bund rallies.²⁹⁹

As mentioned, there were collective narratives that pointed the country toward international leadership and others that pointed it toward internal self-absorption. What was needed in the last years of the interwar period was a dominant script for American internationalism. The country needed an ideology that would unite it and reorient the nation toward its genuine national purpose. To this end, Franklin Roosevelt strived mightily. Finally, thanks in large part to the aggressive military actions of Germany and Japan, he succeeded in establishing the New Deal liberal internationalism that brought the country into the Second World War.³⁰⁰

In the United States, as a substantial literature documents, the New Deal vastly extended the power of the state to manage the private sector. It built a new paradigm for the state as a management system for American political economy. The American or Rooseveltian script set in motion the institutional reforms for reviving liberal capitalism in the face of a near total collapse of the economy. There was near starvation in the Appalachians, and all around the major cities squatters lived in shacks. Food riots, corporate bankruptcies, and bank closings left the country on the very edge of the precipice when Roosevelt assumed office in March 1933. The state had to restore what the markets had utterly destroyed, and do it in a manner speedy enough to prevent the massive social unrest that lay just over the horizon. Roosevelt worked to save American capitalism, while in Europe and East Asia liberalism shook under the assault from totalitarian ideologies. In Germany, the economic crisis led Hitler to win power two months before Franklin Roosevelt's inauguration and the start of the New Deal. The script that gripped the international system in the early 1930s mirrored national crises all over the world. America's struggle to preserve its political economy was juxtaposed with similar crises elsewhere, including, in particular, the Weimar Republic.³⁰¹

²⁹⁹See, for example, Sander A. Diamond, *The Nazi Movement in the United States, 1924–1941* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974); Glen Jeansonne, *Women of the Far Right: The Mothers' Movement and World War II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

³⁰⁰Dallek, Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy, 233–313; Michael Leigh, *Mobilizing Consent: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy, 1937–1947* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1976), 29–70; Casey, *Cautious Crusade*, 30–45.

³⁰¹Irving Bernstein, *The Lean Years: A History of the American Worker, 1920–1933* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960); Robert MacElvaine, *The Great Depression: America, 1929–1941* (New York: Times Books, 1993); William J. Barber, *Designs within Disorder: Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Economists, and the Shaping of American Economic Policy, 1933–1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Peter Lambert, *The Weimar Republic and the Rise of Hitler: Histories and Controversies* (London: Arnold, 1998); Temin, *Lessons from the Great Depression*; E. J.

In the first years of the world depression and the last years of the Weimar Republic, German liberals faced political challenges not only from the National Socialists but also from the German communist party. Part of Hitler's appeal, and perhaps what was critical to his success, was precisely the threat of the full realization of the communist script for Germany. Revolutionary socialism had almost succeeded in achieving power in the aftermath of the First World War. The suppression of the German revolution and economic restructuring, conducted successfully by the Germans in the middle and late 1920s, made the threat recede. However, with the economic collapse that ensured global depression, the extremist parties of the right and the left quickly moved toward the goal of winning national power. The transient prosperity of the 1920s was replaced with the bread lines and homelessness characteristic of the country just after defeat in the First World War. The political opening long awaited by the Nazis enabled Hitler to bring his party toward the center of the German electorate. The frantic worries of Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill as Germany began to rearm would be realized in full. Within six years of reaching power, Hitler would assemble a massive war machine fully capable of winning a major European war against its rivals.³⁰²

The Isolationist Script

New to the world community of the early twentieth century, the liberal technocratic script for the international system was at an early stage of development. In the United States, as noted in earlier parts of this book, the narrative posed two principal ideological systems, or two dominant scripts for the American state. The internationalist script, founded upon the economic and cultural interests of the new cosmopolitan industrial age, was challenged by isolationist ideologies popular in the nation's agrarian and industrial heartland. The ambitious vision of internationalism was supported wholeheartedly by Atlantic-oriented white Protestant elites educated in the Ivy League. However, the internationalist agenda was opposed by a wide swath of public opinion in most areas of the country. Ethnoculturally, German and Scandinavian immigrant populations, the large Irish working class, and other groups shared antipathy toward supporting Britain and France as global allies. The internationalist creed, adopted by both the Democratic and Republican foreign policy establishments, faced stiff opposition from both right wing and left wing isolationist factions. The arguments against internationalism were tough, based upon the long established fears in American society of engaging in a European war. Clearly, the First World War had been costly enough, costing the country more than a hundred thousand men and many billions of dollars. This was so despite the short duration of American involvement. The consistent antipathy toward projecting American

Feuchtwanger, *From Weimar to Hitler: Germany, 1918–33* (New York: MacMillan, 1993), 203–315; *Mommsen*, *The Rise and Fall of Weimar Democracy*, 399–544.

³⁰²*Deist*, *The Build-Up of German Aggression*, 505–40; *E. M. Robertson*, *Hitler's Pre-war Policy and Military Plans, 1933–1939* (New York: Citadel Press, 1967); *R. H. Haigh*, *The Years of Triumph? German Diplomatic and Military Policy, 1933–41* (Hants, UK: Aldershot, 1986), 51–153.

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

power overseas created the political necessity of moderating American participation in international relations.³⁰³

Herbert Hoover, a committed internationalist, some of whose proclivities were deeply Wilsonian, stated this compromise succinctly in a speech that endorsed the Kellogg-Briand Pact:

*Our basis of cooperation to preserve peace among nations must be different from that of other great nations of the world. The security of our geographic situation, our traditional freedom from entanglements in the involved diplomacy of Europe, and our disinterestedness enable us to give a different and in many ways a more effective service to peace. The purpose of our government is to cooperate with others, to use our friendly office and helpfulness free from any advanced commitment or entanglement, as to the character of our action.*³⁰⁴

The speech recapitulated the same ideas found in George Washington's farewell address of 1796, a document that had guided American foreign policy for five generations. Yet, the Washingtonian principles of nonintervention were now set in the new context of the modern 1920s. In the new era, the country was taking an active role in Europe and elsewhere, supporting the world economy and promoting the Wilsonian principles of global economic growth and the development of international law for the adjudication of international conflicts. By design, Hoover's foreign policy script drew upon twin concepts of American exceptionalism. First, the belief in America's redeeming role in world affairs, and second, the unique character of American culture and history, set it apart from its European allies. The redeemer nation, so prominent in its military intervention during the Great War, had abandoned the most ambitious aspects of the Wilsonian script. The progressive or liberal internationalist script still dominated the foreign policies of the interwar administrations, but the outspoken idealism and missionary qualities of American internationalism were muted during the 1920s. They were even more so in the 1930s, until the actions of the anti-Comintern powers ignited the reemergence of America as the redeemer. Without a mandate born of a compelling need for action, the strength and vitality of the American nation as a combatant in the

³⁰³Jonas, *Isolationism in America*, 136–68; Johnson, *The Peace Progressives*, 269–309; Edward Curry, *Irish-America and National Isolationism, 1914–1920* (New York: Arno Press, 1976); James C. Schneider, *Should America Go to War? The Debate over Foreign Policy in Chicago, 1939–1941* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 1–64; John P. Diggins, *Mussolini and Fascism: The View from America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972), 77–181; Wayne Cole, *Charles A. Lindbergh and the Battle against American Intervention in World War II* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974), 78–142; Selig Adler, *The Isolationist Impulse: Its Twentieth-Century Reaction* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1974).

³⁰⁴Herbert Hoover, "Address to the annual conference and good-will congress of the World Alliance for Friendship through the Churches," in *Public Papers of the Presidents, 1930* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1976), 474–78.

name of world freedom was not present. This was true even in the face of Hitler's massive rearmament and the aggressive expansion of Japan in East Asia. Even with the outbreak of war in Europe and Asia, and the victories of the Axis powers against France, Scandinavia, the Low Countries, and the Soviet Union, the national will to go to war to defend the free world was lacking. Until the bombing of Pearl Harbor finally ended the interwar period, America remained a divided country unable to accept its new and formidable role in the world war and in the future of the international system.

Years earlier, when Hoover gave his speech endorsing an end to warfare, a Second World War was not foreseen. It appeared, from the vantage point of the late 1920s, that the future of war would be limited, and perhaps as a practical matter it would end. Social scientists in the 1920s and 1930s, most notably Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago, who studied the causes of war in his mammoth research project funded by the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, found that war was a product of innumerable factors—political, economic, social, cultural, and geographic—including, most especially, competition for scarce resources. In the modern age, many thought, effective international institutions would mediate the competition for such resources. Preventing war required only the construction of an effective internal order for security and development. Clearly, this was the hope of Woodrow Wilson, and it was also the hope of a generation of Western liberal leaders, until the veil of economic crisis and fascist expansion descended upon the world in the early 1930s.³⁰⁵

The American script remained conflicted, as did the scripts for the other democratic nations in the West as the pathology of the Axis fell upon them. Unwilling to accept a role as a global power committed to the defense of the liberal order, the United States stewed in its neutrality as Nazi Germany, fascist Italy, and imperial Japan coalesced into the Axis powers. The inklings of an awakening became a decisive move toward a new script in the first years of the world war. By 1941, the isolationist leanings of an earlier Roosevelt foreign policy were replaced with sentiments that suggested above all else the need for national survival:

*In Lincoln's day the task of the people was to preserve that Nation from disruption from within. In this day the task of the people is to save that Nation and its institutions from disruption from without...The life of a man is three-score years and ten: a little more, a little less. The life of a nation is the fullness of the measure of its will to live.*³⁰⁶

With this statement of January 1941, the interwar period was gone, erased. The peril of the Nazi threat removed the isolationist script that had governed American politics until the eve of the Second World War. Then the American script began its final

³⁰⁵Quincy Wright, *The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace* (New York: Longmans, 1935) and *A Study of War*, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), 2:1284–1352.

³⁰⁶Franklin Roosevelt, "Third Inaugural Address," January 20, 1920, in *Public Papers of the Presidents*, 1942 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1976).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

reorientation within the larger metascript of the Second World War. Roosevelt would respond to Hitler with massive firepower, but not just then. When the war came later, a year later, the country had launched a total war mobilization that would not only redesign the American script and its active components, or institutional subscripts, but would ultimately radically reorder those of its adversaries that were to suffer total defeat and occupation. After the attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, the redeemer script, lost in the 1930s, would find ideological sustenance and political reality in the wake of the next war.

Institutional Scripts

For the industrialized technocratic nations, the interwar period was a period of both crisis and development. The crisis was easy to see in the inability of the institutional regimes that governed macroeconomic policy in the United States, and in the other major market economies, to control the world's economic system. That failure resulted in the gravest economic crisis of the twentieth century. The world economic crisis of the Great Depression led directly to the victory of the Nazis in Germany and to the rise of fascism and fascist ideology on every continent. By the 1930s, the world had to choose between three competing political systems. One was democratic in the broad sense, albeit vastly imperfect. The other two were to become known as the classic totalitarian systems of the right and the left. No more destructive societies ever existed than Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, and imperial Japan.

The interwar period did not give any indication as to how the institutional challenge posed by the Second World War would be met. The "Grand Alliance" was not apparent as the world focused upon war in the late 1930s and as the League of Nations dissolved into ineffectuality. Serendipity and survival would bring Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill to defeat the totalitarianism of the right, in alliance with Joseph Stalin, the totalitarian architect of the left.

The liberal technocratic script, whose instrument in international relations was the League of Nations, failed in its objectives in the twenty years after Versailles. Lacking effective economic knowledge and management skill, the West was unable to coordinate effective monetary and fiscal policies among major nation-states. In politics, the lack of commitment to collective security arrangements left the League of Nations impotent in the face of aggression by the fascist states. Without the institutional and ideological underpinnings for collective management of the international system, the liberal script faced its denouement. Only after France had fallen in June 1940, and the Soviets lay near their destruction in the fall of 1941, were the forces of liberal internationalism emboldened to restate the Wilsonian perspective on world order. It would take a Second World War to reconstruct Wilsonianism and reestablish the world's liberal order, with the United States as the predominant force in world affairs.³⁰⁷

³⁰⁷Offner, *American Appeasement*, 107–33; Christopher Thorne, *The Limits of Foreign Policy: The West, the League, and the Far Eastern Crisis of 1931–1933* (New York: Capricorn, 1972); Elmer Bendiner, *A Time for Angels: The Tragicomic History of the League of Nations* (New York:

Despite the failure of the liberal system, the interwar period also witnessed significant institutional development for the practice of international relations. The changes did not prevent the rise of fascism or the onset of the Great Depression, but they were important to the development of the liberal script as the world moved toward a new and even deadlier world war. Both institutional and intellectual in nature, the international system moved toward a framework of greater cosmopolitanism, even as it prepared for cataclysm. The institutional development had much to do with the expansion of private corporations overseas. Corporate internationalism in the United States—the practice of overseas trade and investment in capital-intensive industries such as oil, finance, and automobiles—boomed steadily through the 1920s, until the protectionism of the world economic crisis crippled its ascent. In the public sector, international organizations developed within the new framework of the League of Nations.³⁰⁸

Intellectual Scripts

In relative terms, the growth of intellectual technology in the interwar period, in the social, physical, and natural sciences, was prosaic in comparison to the knowledge explosion of later periods of twentieth-century history. In all the major countries of the period, the institutions most involved in producing knowledge, university science faculties and engineering and social science groups, were still at very early stages of development. The number of working experimental and theoretical physicists who were responsible for the physics revolution of the early twentieth century was actually quite small. The innovators in computer engineering, such as Vannevar Bush at MIT in the 1920s, had to struggle for a few tens of thousands of dollars in research funding for the development of computing machines. Nonetheless, innovations in physics and mathematics and information science laid the foundations for both the nuclear age and the information age. The period saw the continuation of the scientific revolution in physics, namely, the full explication of the new revolutionary theories of the universe: relativity and quantum dynamics. The new physics would lead directly to the Manhattan Project. In information science, mathematicians began to develop the concepts for a digital computer. The first electromechanical computers were under development in the United States and Great Britain, with the principal benefit being military.³⁰⁹

Knopf, 1975); E. P. Walters, *A History of the League of Nations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), 767–810; Casey, *Cautious Crusade*, 80–129.

³⁰⁸Walters, *A History of the League of Nations*, 268–310; Geoffrey Jones, ed., *Transnational Corporations: A Historical Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Geoffrey Jones, *British Multinational Banking, 1830–1990* (London: Oxford University Press, 1993).

³⁰⁹Peter Galison, Michael Gordin, and David Kaise, eds., *Science and Society: The History of Modern Physical Science in the Twentieth Century*, 4 vols. (New York: Routledge, 2001); Helge Kragh, *Quantum Generations: A History of Physics in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994); G. Pascal Zachary, *Endless Frontier: Vannevar Bush, Engineer of the American Century* (New York: Free Press, 1997); Vannevar Bush, *Operational Circuit Analysis* (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1937); U.S. Office of Scientific Research and Development,

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Despite the effective limits on the development of scientific and practical engineering knowledge, over the longer term the scientific knowledge of the interwar period would lay the foundations for what would come in successive periods of the accelerating technocratic age. Prewar science, inevitably, became a strong catalyst for truly momentous changes in science and technology. The legacies of interwar research, both civilian and military, included the development of space technology, cybernetics, and solid-state electronics (that is, the invention of the transistor and later the microprocessor). The Second World War had truly massive effects on human memory and political development. However, the intellectual technology of the century's middle period would be of equal or greater historical importance to the future of human society. The new scientific theories and technologies of the 1920s and 1930s would soon be incorporated into the epistemological systems of the Cold War era. In turn, those systems of knowledge, acquired in the long march of twentieth-century warfare, would be quintessential assets to the new age of molecular biology, chemistry, and information processing that galvanized the world's elites of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Without any hyperbole, one can say that the political, intellectual, and technological basis of the contemporary world was rooted in the 1920s and 1930s.³¹⁰

Isolationism vs. Internationalism: The American Epistemology for Global Affairs

The international system had achieved a measure of order in the 1920s. In principle, according to the designs of Versailles and successive international agreements, the world's major powers followed the Wilsonian design for international relations. The Wilsonian internationalist script informed a sophisticated diplomatic discourse on controlling the outbreak of war, expanding world commerce, and promoting economic and political development internationally. Disarmament conferences in London and Washington kept the major powers involved in serious discussions and agreements on the global balance of power. The Kellogg-Briand treaty of 1928 committed all of the world's major powers, and ultimately sixty-two nations, to renounce war as an instrument of foreign policy. International trade expanded as industrialization continued its development in Europe, North America, and Japan. The world community as a whole was committed to stable, peaceful international relations, based upon international law

Science, the Endless Frontier: A Report to the President by Vannevar Bush (*Washington, DC: GPO, 1945*); James M. Nyce and Paul Kahn, eds., *From Memex to Hypertext: Vannevar Bush and the Mind's Machine* (Boston: Academic Press, 1991).

³¹⁰Quantum physics in all of its complex variations appeared full-blown in Central Europe during the mid-1920s. Galison, Gordon, and Kaise, *Science and Society*, vol. 4, *Quantum Histories*; Millican and Clark, *The Legacy of Alan Turing*; Jagdish Mehra and Helmut Reichenberg, *The Historical Development of Quantum Theory*, 6 vols. (New York: Springer, 1982–2000); Mary Jo Nye, *The Pursuit of Modern Chemistry and Physics, 1800–1940* (New York: Twayne, 1996), 189–224; Steve Adams, *Frontiers in Twentieth Century Physics* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2000), 3–108.

and a gradual improvement of trade relations. Superficially, the international system bore some of the characteristics of neo-Kantian universalism. Predicated upon the principles of expanding free trade, scientific progress, and the eventual abolition of colonialism, interwar progressive ideology strove for the ideal of a peaceful world, no longer in need of military force.³¹¹

American foreign policy nationalists and internationalists disagreed on the course of United States foreign policy. Yet, the final policy of whomever was placed in the Oval Office would be a synthesis of diverse ideological viewpoints. It would always be a narrative balancing group interests and scripts, just as one would expect in a heterogeneous society. As noted, for policy to work and obtain public support, it was necessary to present it as a balance or amalgam of scripted elements. So, Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover's foreign policies combined corporate internationalism with the Wilsonian emphasis on treaty law and diplomacy, as well as on the nationalist creed of protecting the nation from destructive foreign wars. In continuity with the postwar Republican administrations, Franklin Roosevelt's diplomacy included elements of both nationalism and internationalism. He too was a "juggler," according to the Roosevelt scholar Warren Kimball. Roosevelt required an operational political ideology and narrative script that was synchronous with the adaptive liberal culture of twentieth-century America.³¹²

Yet, despite the intentions of a generation of experienced diplomats, learned international lawyers, and social scientist advisers, the First World War led to the even more catastrophic Second World War. Despite the energy and enthusiasm for a new international system based upon collective security and development, the world's liberal order, provided by committed internationalist statesmen, masked profound underlying tensions and fissures. Barely below the surface of the facade of internationalism in Germany's Weimar Republic, and across Central and Eastern Europe in the successor states to the old Hapsburg, Hollenzollern, and Romanov empires, popular discontent had laid the grounds for struggles between fascists and communists. Mussolini gained power in Italy in 1923 and proceeded to turn that relatively new nation into an authoritarian, or, as Mussolini termed it, a "totalitarian" state. Extreme nationalism in Germany had only a small base of support in the 1920s, but it was a force that, while remaining in the background, clearly had potential. The problems for liberalism and the liberal technocratic script of the machine age were the ideological challenges from the both the far right and the far left. On a world scale, fascism gained political momentum from the 1920s to the beginning of the Second World War. Its corollary on the left, Marxism-Leninism, did the same, taking advantage of the contradictions of capitalism. The liberal

³¹¹Margot Louria, *Triumph and Downfall: America's Pursuit of Peace and Prosperity, 1921–1933* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001); Lewis Ethan Ellis, Frank B. Kellogg and American Foreign Relations, 1925–1929 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1961); Leffler, *Elusive Quest*, 82–230; Hogan, *Informal Entente*, 13–78; Iriye, *The Globalization of America*, 103–48.

³¹²Kimball, *The Juggler*, 3–19.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

regimes of the United States and Great Britain faced radical ideologies because liberalism or democratic capitalism failed to achieve broad, substantive economic and social equality that cut across ethnic, racial, and class categories. When the world economic crisis came in the early 1930s, those contradictions allowed the competing scripts of the right and the left to gain ground and, in many countries (including, most critically, Germany), absolute power.

The political fight between isolationists and internationalists in the interwar period was a continuation of the argument over American imperialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the battle over American intervention in the First World War. In the aftermath of the Great War, the isolationist arguments gained ground, especially with respect to participation in European foreign wars. The economic crisis of the early 1930s turned American passivity into a brief period of complete isolationism in the mid-1930s. At the height of the age of appeasement in the 1930s, as totalitarianism and irredentist nationalism rose to power throughout Europe and East Asia, American policy was largely muted and ineffectual. The isolationists were so strong in the period preceding the outbreak of war in Europe and Asia that they precluded any attempt by the Roosevelt administration to intervene directly in world affairs. The script had changed almost 180 degrees. It turned the redeemer nation inward, where salvation was to be found in rescuing American society from its poverty and institutional crisis.³¹³

Isolationist politics enveloped American policy even as Roosevelt struggled to respond to Hitler's and Tojo's expansionist aggressions. The grip of isolationist thought wasn't broken until the Second World War began to go disastrously wrong for the Allies. The bifurcation between conservative isolationism and liberal internationalism encapsulated the conflict over changing political economy and political culture in American society. The literature is very clear on the divergence in ideological perspectives. The internationalist perspective represented an expanding intellectual construct for America's relationship to the world. It was a relationship that was defined by broad cultural, commercial, scientific, demographic, and political exchanges. The isolationists rejected the script, for reasons particular to different strands of isolationist/nationalist thought. Clearly, the conservative isolationists feared the power of the New Deal-defined state. The idea of an enlarged and intrusive national government, premised on internationalism, militated against the isolationist concept of a limited and insular institutional system. The two competing scripts for the American state opposed one another, compromising the internationalism of every presidential administration from Woodrow Wilson to Franklin Roosevelt, right up until the spring of 1940, when the fate of the world hung in the balance.

The isolationist position was argued poignantly by conservative nationalists such as William Randolph Hearst and Robert McCormick, and so-called peace progressives such

³¹³*Divine*, *The Illusion of Neutrality*, 81–121; *Dallek*, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy*, 78–170; *Donald Drummond*, *The Passing of American Neutrality, 1937–1941* (*Ann Arbor: University of Michigan*, 1968), 20–48.

as senators Hiram Johnson, William Borah, and Gerald Nye.³¹⁴ They chose to understand the nature of the international system in terms of the last century, when continental expansion and insular belief in American exceptionalism kept the nation isolated and fiercely nationalistic in its foreign relations. The nineteenth-century paradigm viewed America as a sacred and inviolate haven from the desperate circumstances of Europe. According to George Washington and most of his successors, it was incumbent upon Americans to protect their society from unwelcome foreign influences, including the disastrous military confrontations that were the ruin of European states. The ideologists of American isolationism were categorical in their rejection of American intervention, prior to Pearl Harbor. From the point of view of interwar isolationist thinkers, the costs and risks of participating in the Second World War would be catastrophic. The conflict between Germany and its great power neighbors was not a vital interest of the United States. Primarily, it was a war over long-standing imperial interests that the United States opposed for reasons both moral and strategic. Even with the possibility of German victory, the isolationists were vehement that the United States had no compelling reason to intervene directly on the side of the Allies. The conservative nationalist script viewed American national security as hemispheric, not global. In the wake of a Nazi assault on France and Great Britain, and, in 1941, on the Soviet Union, the balance of American interests remained to ensure the territorial defense of the Western Hemisphere—and no more.

The political script and epistemology for interwar American isolationism suggested that Americans needed only to look at their roots. They had only to understand the lives and administrations of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington to know that their vital interests could not be in Europe, but in the American heartland. Conservative political knowledge envisioned the pre-New Deal order, the laissez-faire market economy of the 1800s, as the only truly acceptable form of civil society. The broad designs of internationalists to integrate nation-states through international organizations and the development of ever more inclusive international law would demolish the isolationist vision of a Puritan utopia where a largely white Protestant nation remained secure in its land, resources, and people. There was no reason to go abroad when the new Zion had all that it needed to flourish and the outside world threatened cultural, racial, economic, and political diffusion.³¹⁵

³¹⁴Ian Mugridge, *The View from Xanadu: William Randolph Hearst and United States Foreign Policy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995), 127–52; Richard Norton Smith, *The Colonel: The Life and Legend of Robert R. McCormick, 1880–1955* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), 387–419; Johnson, *The Peace Progressives*, 151–236; Richard Coke Lower, *A Bloc of One: The Political Career of Hiram W. Johnson* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), 307–33; Robert James Maddox, *William E. Borah and American Foreign Policy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970), 215–47; Wayne Cole, *Senator Gerald P. Nye and American Foreign Relations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962), 151–201.

³¹⁵Dreiser, *Is America Worth Saving?*, 16–58; Wayne Cole, *America First: The Battle against Intervention, 1940–1941* (New York: Octagon Books, 1971). A comprehensive collection of isolationist thought can be found in Justus D. Doenecke, ed., *In Danger Undaunted: The Anti-*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Interpreting the Nazi threat in the years just before Pearl Harbor, the America First Committee applied systematic reasoning to oppose America's intervention. The threat of Nazism, acknowledged as a brutal regime, was broken down into potential political, economic, and strategic scenarios. The risks of Nazi victory were examined against the isolationist intellectuals' assessment of the potential costs of preventing it. The arguments, most often supported with graphs and tables, always suggested the limits of German power. Even without American intervention, so the argument went, the Nazis could dominate all of Europe and the vast regions of European colonization. They would exhaust themselves with the limited resources at their disposal. The Nazi conquests would be unsustainable and open to attack by the free countries of the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere. American intervention on the scale envisioned by the Roosevelt administration would threaten the stability of the still fragile U.S. economy and risk the loss of perhaps millions of young men to defeat Adolf Hitler.

In the script and political epistemology for American internationalism, human freedom at that time and for generations unborn required the United States to destroy Nazism. There was no hope of compromise. War, no matter the cost, had to be fought and won. Interwar internationalism viewed the world from a social scientific as well as historical perspective. The internationalist ideology viewed the pervasive threat of Nazi victory as a central assault on the survival of liberal civilization. Freedom required a moral crusade against the Hitlerites. No matter the cost or sacrifice, the American liberal internationalists at the end of the interwar period called for the total defeat of the Third Reich. It was entirely clear to the *New York Times*, the *New Herald Tribune*, and the Roosevelt administration that the Nazi threat exceeded the threats of all previous European powers with respect to American national security. It was very clear to internationalists, most of whom had strong cultural and ethnic affiliations to Europe, that war was necessary. The internationalist or neo-Wilsonian script would not countenance a fascist world or pan-fascist Europe.

Somewhat ironically, internationalists and isolationists shared many of the same methods of analysis for understanding the international environment. Both groups used comparative statistics and financial, strategic, and political analyses to support their positions. Neither side was misled by the respective natures of Nazism, Japanese imperialism, or Soviet communism, nor did they underestimate the prospective costs of the war to the United States. The relative preparedness of the country for war was understood by both sides to be poor. Yet, because their interpretative frameworks were so radically different, based upon alternative concepts of national interest, their conclusions were diametrically opposed to one another. In viewing the fascists just prior to American intervention, the nationalist isolationists and pro-war internationalists experienced quite similar emotions. Fear of and revulsion against the Nazi threat were common. American culture was united by a common appreciation of the value of the personal freedom afforded by a democratic constitution and the practice of civil liberties. In general, nearly

interventionist Movement of 1940–1941 as Revealed in the Papers of the America First Committee (Stanford, CA: *Stanford University Press*, 1990).

all Americans favored the development of democratic institutions around the world. Yet, with respect to American intervention in foreign lands, two different scripts energized citizens in different directions.³¹⁶

The Technocratic Path: Nazi Germany

A central question in the international history of the twentieth century concerns Hitler's rise to power. As noted, the consensus in the literature suggests that his ascension was concurrent with and a direct result of the world economic crisis of the early 1930s. Without the Great Depression, we may surmise, Hitler and Nazism would have declined and receded in German and European politics. The German script, it seemed, was connected to the Nazi script on an elemental level. The Germans had been utterly humiliated—in a sense, emasculated—by the terms of the war settlement. Interlocking scripts, cultural, political, group, institutional, and individual, were joined in the late 1920s and early 1930s as the Great Depression unfolded in North America and Europe. The world crisis became a German crisis, and the scripts that would create the path for Adolf Hitler responded to the world crisis. There is no doubt that Hitler came to power in Germany because of the opportunity of the world economic crisis of 1929 to 1933. The power of his rhetoric and the brutal tactics of his party resonated with the latent pathologies within the German public. With prosperity, the Nazi movement would have been lost; but with the desperation of the depression that came upon Central Europe, the organizing currents for German totalitarianism, found in the culture and institutions of early twentieth-century Germany, responded to Hitler like clockwork.³¹⁷

Under his charismatic leadership, the far-right Nazi party instilled fear in a public that had known genuine parliamentary democracy for only a decade. In 1932 and 1933, the Nazis used every political tactic, as well as their leader's impassioned ultranationalist rhetoric, to move within striking range of a plurality in a national election. They won using the modern techniques of a mass media campaign as well as the tactical deployment of the brownshirts to intimidate opponents of the right and the left.

When Hitler assumed the role of chancellor in January 1933, all Europe and indeed the world knew that he was a grave threat to world peace. His intentions and behaviors,

³¹⁶Wayne Cole, *Roosevelt and the Isolationists, 1932–45* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), 141–86, 274–330; Cole, *America First*, 51–103; Casey, *Cautious Crusade*, 16–30; Drummond, *The Passing of American Neutrality*, 49–111; Divine, *The Illusion of Neutrality*, 286–335; Charles Beard, *The Devil Theory of War* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1936); John Chamberlain, *The American Stakes* (Rathway, NJ: Quinn & Boden, 1940), 145–94; James J. Martin, *American Liberalism and World Politics, 1931–1941: Liberalism's Press and Spokesmen on the Road Back to War between Mukden and Pearl Harbor*, 2 vols. (New York: Devin-Adair, 1964), 2:1139–88.

³¹⁷Kershaw, *Hubris*, 316–495; Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 117–230; Robert Clark Thomson, *The Fall of the German Republic* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), 426–88; Mommsen, *The Rise and Fall of Weimar Democracy*, 490–544; Detlev Peukert, *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1992), 249–72.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

since he had become a recognizable public figure in the early 1920s, were thoroughly transparent. His militant, overbearing attitude toward Germany's adversaries, so evident in his standard rally speech, was the quintessential design for his rise to preeminence. Hitler worked to become the leader of a radical antiliberal movement to recover what he had lost during the First World War. Clearly, he used hate as political tool, but it was a hatred grounded in his personal life history of disappointment and failure. He moved to the center of German history in 1933 and departed in 1945, after his world war left his country, and many on each side of it, in a state of catastrophic damage. The damage, both human and material, would haunt two generations after the war with the lessons of victory over an absolute evil.

Hitler did not invent Nazism out of whole cloth, nor was he an independent agent that controlled its path. He was an agent of larger historical forces that moved quickly in the twentieth century and inflicted horrific crimes against human beings. Hitler's script was part of the Nazi script, and vice versa. The Nazi script organized the world into a racial pyramid. Nazi racial science promulgated the view that the Aryan race was biologically superior to all others. Referencing the race theory of intelligence that was common in the nineteenth century among many European and American intellectuals, the Nazi vision combined civilization and biology into a racial and patriarchal technocratic system of power. The National Socialist doctrine viewed Aryan eugenics as the most enlightened method of propagating a new and genetically superior race of Germanic peoples. The futurism of Nazi Germany envisioned a new Rome built on the innate warlike courage of Hitler's Germany, where school children were indoctrinated with pagan rituals of war and loyalty to the Nazi state. The symbolism and dramaturgy of Nazism projected a society that was undergoing a radical transformation into a new, thoroughly militarized nation. War would prove the superiority of German culture and biology in a world occupied by genetically inferior races. Through training, organization, and the dedicated application of scientific resources to the Nazi military-industrial complex, Hitler's regime expected to dominate Europe. The same general goals that had engaged an earlier generation of Germans would be operational for Hitler. To a large degree, much of what Hitler wanted, and much of what his followers oriented themselves toward, was a stable and integrated European state system that would, of course, be Germanized. The "master race" would expand from Germany through the heartland of European Russia. Undesirable racial elements would, of course, be eliminated. This was Hitler's plan in the early 1920s. It was clearly articulated in *Mein Kampf* and was being carried out, to the letter, right up until Soviet tanks penetrated the fatherland and the war was acknowledged, even by the Führer, to be utterly lost.³¹⁸

³¹⁸Jean-Michel Angebert, *The Occult and the Third Reich: The Mystical Origins of Nazism and the Search for the Holy Grail* (New York: Macmillan, 1974); Woodruff Smith, *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Henry Friedlander, *The Origins of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); William Brustein, *Logic of Evil: The Social Origins of the Nazi Party, 1925–1933* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 1–29; Mosse, *The Crisis of German*

Lebensraum and Race: Nazi Ideology

During the interwar years, the essential beliefs about the origins of war by historians and social scientists reflected the understanding that war, as with all group conflict, was fundamentally economic in nature. Certainly, the economic origins of war coincided perfectly with textual understanding of National Socialism. Clearly, underlying National Socialist ideology were economic interests connected to the survival and security of the German nation-state. These interests were not disguised or coded. Rather, they were seen plainly by both the Nazis and their many adversaries around the world. Nazi race doctrine proclaimed the biological superiority of the Aryan race and its privilege to the resources of the east in the Slavic lands of Europe. Grain and oil, essential raw materials for the German economy, would be the spoils of conquest if the Reich were victorious in its war with the Soviet Union. The industrial systems of totalitarian societies require the physical possession of resources. International markets are costly and create potentially dependent relationships. Japanese fascism sought to secure the resources of East Asia through the creation of the Japanese “East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere.” In this way, the iron, tin, rubber, rice, and oil of the Asian mainland and the Dutch East Indies would finance the creation of the Japanese East Asian superstate. Nazi designs on the Ukraine and the oil-rich Caucasus region had the same objective. Mussolini’s plans for a North African Italian empire were similar. In the Nazi and Italian fascist mythologies, the Germans and Italians were to reconstruct the Roman Empire. A new Roman age would be born, in which the blood bond of the Aryan nation would glory in its scientific-industrial achievements and its military power.³¹⁹

The Japanese, Germans, Italians, and indeed all of the leading powers of the interwar period saw their destinies in the pursuit of technocratic civilization. Yet, it was a question of what kind of technocracy. The Nazi, Italian, Japanese, and Soviet technocracies were in many ways similar and dissimilar to the British, French, and American versions. All concepts of modernity, liberal, fascist, or Marxist-Leninist, contained the same ideas and visions of technological innovation. There was the increasing use of the new forms of energy and machinery, namely, hydrocarbon fuels, airplanes, private automobiles, fast ocean liners, and the like, as well as the new communication media of radio, cinema, and telephones. Stalin and Hitler were inspired by the new consumer society that was pioneered in the United States. Hitler embraced the concept of mass-produced automobiles; Stalin envisioned thousands of movie theaters entertaining Soviet communities in the remotest areas of the country. However, the totalitarian visions differed with regard to the final objectives of technocracy. National Socialist technocracy

Ideology; Stackelberg, Hitler’s Germany; Edmund Vermeil, “The Origin, Nature and Development of German Nationalist Ideology in the 19th and 20th Centuries,” in *International Council for the Humanities, The Third Reich* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1975), 3–112.

³¹⁹Allan Bullock, “The Political Ideas of Adolf Hitler,” in *International Council for the Humanities, Third Reich*, 350–78, and Henry M. Pachter, “National-Socialist and Fascist Propaganda for the Conquest of Power,” in *ibid.*, 710–42.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

would design a scientifically based nation of “racially pure” Aryans, where undesirable biological elements such as the Jews and Romany peoples of Europe, as well as others, would be eliminated. Simultaneously, the Nazi vision was clean, antiseptic, and modern (with advanced engineering concepts for architecture, industry, and military weapons systems) as well as anachronistic in its resurrection of pagan rites and the glorification of the ancient mythologies of the Teutonic tribes and the Roman Empire.³²⁰

During the relatively peaceful and cooperative decade of the 1920s, it was apparent that despite the new regime for collective security in international relations, the great powers were profoundly leery of each other’s actions and behaviors. There was no question that national interests continued to rule international strategy. All of the major nation-states had clear national objectives separate from those of their allies as well as their adversaries. French foreign policy viewed containment of Germany as essential, but strictly in the context of French national security. The French were wary of Anglo-American domination as well as the aggressive nature of France’s historic enemy. Britain had economic and strategic rivalries with France as well as with Russia and the United States. Germany had to be contained, but the Soviet Union was a threat to British interests in her commonwealth. The Soviets viewed all the capitalist countries as enemies but started a covert alliance of military cooperation with the Weimar Republic to subvert the Versailles system. In the Far East, the United States and Great Britain contained the path of Japanese expansion. All of the great powers wanted to protect their interests in the Pacific, and each had its particular nationalist, self-defined vision of the balance of power in that part of the world. In the last analysis, despite the mediation of the League of Nations, which concluded a series of important international peace treaties during the 1920s, the institutional structure for international relations in the interwar period seemed wholly inadequate in a world dominated by a half-dozen great powers. Despite the formal commitment to liberal internationalism as a foundation of international law and diplomatic method, each power connected to its own particular understandings of world affairs and the scripted dimensions of its own foreign policies.³²¹

³²⁰Barkai, *Nazi Economics*, 158–242; R. J. Overy, *War and Economy in the Third Reich* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 261–314; Albert Speer, *Infiltration* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981); Sheila Fitzpatrick, ed., *Stalinism: New Directions* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Robert C. Tucker, *Stalin in Power: The Revolution from Above, 1928–1941* (New York: Norton, 1990), 44–118; Philip Sharnoff, *Principles of Scientific Socialism: A Primer on Marxism-Leninism* (Palo Alto, CA: Ramparts Press, 1983); Erik P. Hoffmann and Robbin F. Laird, *Technocratic Socialism: The Soviet Union in the Advanced Industrial Era* (Durham, NC: Duke University, 1985), 33–120.

³²¹Iriye, *After Imperialism*, 25–88, and *Power and Culture*, 1–35; Hall, *Britain, America, and Arms Control*, 116–90; Leffler, *Elusive Quest*, 231–315; Costigliola, *Awkward Dominion*, 184–261; Robert Boyce, ed., *French Foreign and Defence Policy, 1918–1940: The Decline and Fall of a Great Power* (New York: Routledge, 1998); Steven Merritt Miner, *Between Churchill and Stalin: The Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the Origins of the Grand Alliance* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988); F. S. Northedge and Audrey Wells, *Britain and Soviet Communism: The Impact of a Revolution* (London: Macmillan, 1982); Eric Ericson, *Feeding the German Eagle:*

The literature on the origins of the Second World War suggests, in the strongest terms, that although there was a broad intellectual understanding of the necessity of collective security in world affairs, unilateralism remained a far stronger force. There was no effective international response to the Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1935. The Italian aggression against one of two independent native countries on the African continent was met with a feeble embargo on war materials. An oil embargo might have brought Mussolini to his knees, yet the collective will to implement such a measure was not present. The same was true in the case of the Spanish Civil War, the German occupation of the Rhineland, the Austrian annexation, and, finally, the most notorious act of appeasement, the Munich pact of October 1938. Appeasement was the Western script in its response to the crisis of Nazi ascendance. The lessons of the Great War had forced the psychological reorientation of early twentieth-century nation-states from the glorification of national wars to their near rejection, under almost all circumstances. The avoidance of war was the paramount objective of the West in its response to Adolf Hitler. The Nazis could worship war. They could bask in the vision of ancient imperial Rome reborn in the eagle and swastika. The pagan symbols of the Third Reich, paraded by tens of thousands of dedicated followers in torch-lit marches, carried Nazi culture to a level of collective euphoria. Indeed, the Nazis could militarize the German state to whatever level of war preparedness they required. Yet, the democracies of Western Europe and North America could hardly worship militarism. The liberal technocratic script/ideology demanded appeasement. The response was wholly inadequate and very quickly disastrous, but the collective aversion to war in the democracies superseded the alternative script for an active strategic coalition against the Germans.³²²

Soviet Union: Stalinism and the International System

In most respects, with the important exception of the Holocaust, Stalin's domestic practices and state ideology were even more controlled and repressive than those of National Socialism. Both regimes subscribed to the absolutist state in the Jacobin tradition. Yet Stalin, following the Bolshevik methods established by Lenin, was willing to "liquidate" any "class" whom he perceived to be an obstacle to the building of his power. The individual had even fewer rights under Stalin than under Hitler. Stalin's script was consistent with the brutality of czarist rulers since medieval times. Yet, in terms of

Soviet Economic Aid to Nazi Germany, 1933–1941 (*Westport, CT: Praeger, 1999*), 1–71; Tobias R. Philbin, *The Lure of Neptune: German-Soviet Naval Collaboration and Ambitions, 1919–1941* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), 1–21, 41–77.

³²² Andrew J. Crozier, *The Causes of the Second World War* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997), 75–146; Offner, *American Appeasement*; Robert Edwin Herzstein, *Roosevelt and Hitler: Prelude to War* (New York: Wiley, 1994), 71–106; Victor Rothwell, *The Origins of the Second World War* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 56–96; Gerhard Weinberg, *The Foreign Policy of Hitler's Germany*, 313–534; Gordon Martel, "Military Planning and the Origins of the Second World War," in McKercher and Legault, *Military Planning and the Origins of the Second World War in Europe*, 12–35.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

the magnitude of his ruthlessness, he far exceeded any of his precommunist predecessors. Through executions, forced population removals, and mass imprisonment in the Soviet Gulag, Stalin killed far more of his own people prior to the Second World War than the Nazis would through their destruction in 1945. The Nazis murdered millions of Jews, Gypsies, Russians, and Poles with little concern or remorse. The Soviets were not genocidal like their Nazi and Japanese totalitarian counterparts, but the state was perfectly capable of executing Stalin's orders to arrest millions of ordinary Soviets with little justification other than Stalin's paranoia.³²³

Stalin distinguished himself from Lenin in his concept of revolution. For Lenin, Trotsky, and other founders of the Soviet state, world revolution, not the development of Russian socialism, was the objective of the Communist Party. The early forays of Lenin to support socialist revolution in Germany and Eastern Europe were entirely consistent with the objectives of the leader of the first communist state. Stalin turned away from Lenin's goals. His personalist rule was designed to strengthen the Soviet Union—to build the former Russian empire into an industrialized, fully armed, modern state. To this end, he afforded no mercy to anyone who he thought impeded his rule or his goals. Massive heavy industrialization occurred in the Soviet Union from the late 1920s onward. The industrialization was linked inextricably not only to the burgeoning Soviet Gulag, but to the complete militarization of the country.

As the West struggled with the Great Depression and the rise of Hitler and his fascist allies, Stalin assumed the hostility of the United States and Great Britain, just as he accepted the same enmity from Germany and Japan. The Soviets acted aggressively to forge diplomatic relations and both formal and informal ententes with the capitalist nation-states that surrounded them. Nonetheless, the lessons of Russian history were not lost on Lenin, Stalin, Molotov, and the remainder of the Soviet leadership. No matter the extent of their treaty relations with the West and with Japan and China in East Asia, the thrust of Soviet development policy was not only economic but military development of the highest order. When the German army attacked the Soviet Union in 1941, it invaded a country that was more heavily armed than the Third Reich. The massive strategic incompetence of Stalin and his purged military created the conditions for the grotesque disaster of the German invasion. However, Stalin would survive and so would the Soviet war machine, as the absolutist tyranny of the Soviet state fought an external enemy, the German Wehrmacht, with a ruthlessness equal to its invader's..³²⁴

³²³Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror: Stalin's Purge of the Thirties* (New York: Macmillan, 1973), 214–90; J. Arch Getty, *Origins of the Great Purges: The Soviet Communist Party Reconsidered, 1933–1938* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 113–71.

³²⁴John Erickson, *The Soviet High Command: A Military-Political History, 1918–1941* (Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2001), 449–509, 628–68; *Institute for Military History, Germany and the Second World War*, vol. 4, *The Attack on the Soviet Union*; Charles W. Sydnor Jr., *Soldiers of Destruction: The SS Death's Head Division, 1933–1945* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990).

Through most of the interwar period, the Soviets were de facto allies of Germany. The Weimar Republic relied upon the Soviets to produce the planes and other weapons it was prohibited from manufacturing and deploying under the Versailles Treaty. Up until Hitler's Operation Barbarossa in June 1941, the Soviets supplied the Third Reich with the oil and foodstuffs it needed to carry on its war with the Allies. Under Stalin, the Soviet state was insular in its foreign relations, but it industrialized with enormous speed. By the start of the Second World War, the Soviets had built a military-industrial complex that was fully capable of supporting total war against Nazi Germany. Through universal conscription and heavy industrialization modeled on the mass production techniques pioneered by American industry, the Soviets had far more tanks, artillery, and aircraft than the German Wehrmacht. What the Soviets lacked was a modern military organization to effectively use the industrial armaments that its state industries had so dutifully produced. Like National Socialist Germany and fascist Italy, the Soviet Union was a thoroughly militarized state. When Hitler and Stalin signed their nonaggression pact in August 1939, each side viewed the other as a natural and inevitable enemy. There were few if any illusions about the practicality of the arrangement.³²⁵

In a large sense, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia were both modern technocratic nation-states dedicated to the application of technocratic knowledge. That is, they were oriented toward the use of modern science and engineering disciplines to solve the problems and pursue the objectives of their regimes. In the same way that the liberal nations of the West saw the hope and promise of applied technocratic knowledge for the development of greater wealth and efficiency, Hitler and Stalin focused on the development of weapons and industrial systems that would transform their nations into globally dominant military powers. At the same time, the personalist rule of both men, and in particular the antipathy that both men had toward power centers outside of their purview—for example, among scientists and engineers—created decidedly nonrational policies and institutions in both countries. Scholars have long described National Socialism as having a conflicted institutional regime in which power blocs under the control of “mini-Führers” competed for the approval of the maximum leader.³²⁶ The same was true under Stalin, who made decisions about economics and diplomacy strictly in

³²⁵Dunn, *The Soviet Economy and the Red Army*; Wolfgang Leonhard, *Betrayal: The Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989); Anthony Read and David Fisher, *The Deadly Embrace: Hitler, Stalin and the Nazi-Soviet Pact, 1939–1941* (London: M. Joseph, 1988), 221–59; Gabriel Gorodetsky, *Grand Delusion: Stalin and the German Invasion of Russia* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 1–88; Bernd Wegner, ed., *From Peace to War: Germany, Soviet Russia, and the World, 1939–1941* (Providence, RI: Berghahn Books, 1997); Jürgen Förster, Joachim Hoffman, and Rolf-Dieler Müller, “German War Policy and the Soviet Union 1940–1941,” in Wilhelm Deist et al., *Germany and the Second World War*, vol. 4, *The Attack on the Soviet Union* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 13–224.

³²⁶Monika Renneberg and Mark Walker, “Scientists, Engineers and National Socialism,” in Renneberg and Walker, *Science, Technology and National Socialism, 1–30*; Jürgen Förster, *Operation Barbarossa as a War of Conquest and Annihilation in the Attack on the Soviet Union, 481–524*; David Crew, ed., *Nazism and German Society, 1933–1945* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

terms of consolidating and perpetuating his rule as the only arbiter of state power in the Soviet Union. Under these circumstances, the rationality prized by interwar liberal institutions and intellectual communities was opposed by the romanticism of the personal rulers of the two most powerful totalitarian states in the interwar period. Under totalitarianism, technocratic knowledge was oriented toward the development of military power for the state. Yet, the lack of a more rational system of political control left both Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia to face the disadvantages that free societies, which valued individuals, were far less susceptible to.³²⁷

Japanese Imperialism: The East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere

Since the end of national isolation with the Meiji restoration in 1863, the Japanese had forged a determined program of industrialization and military modernization. Japan refused to accept the domination of the West. Instead of accepting European and American imperial designs on East Asia, the Japanese, over decades, strove to build their own regional empire. Like so many national scripts, the Japanese narrative placed the country at the center of the universe. The nation's self-perceived destiny was in its national icon: a red rising sun. At one with the physical and spiritual worlds, the Japanese drew upon the resources of their culture, discipline, self-sacrifice, and a vast group-centered identity. The formidable military traditions of Tokugawa Japan affected the expansion of the empire into Taiwan and the Korean peninsula. The Russo-Japanese war of 1904–1905 was a spectacular victory for Japanese naval power. It checked the expansion of Russia into Manchuria and established Japan as a major regional power.³²⁸

Japan maintained a formal military alliance system with Great Britain through the First World War and the 1920s, as both countries shared common interests in keeping Russian, American, and other great powers from dominating the western Pacific. Japanese participation in the First World War on the side of Great Britain and the Allies gave her possession of German colonies in the Pacific. By the 1920s, rising Japanese military power and territorial designs in East Asia made her a significant threat to all the Western powers. The Washington Conference of 1921–1922 attempted to limit Japanese expansion through treaty limitations on the size of great power navies. Despite its strategic and economic ascendancy, by the early 1930s Japan remained surrounded in East Asia by the great Western powers. All the Western nations had interests in China, including special treaty rights to ensure their access to the nation's markets and resources. The rest of Asia, including the Philippine and East Indian archipelagoes, French

³²⁷ Kershaw and Lewin, *Stalinism and Nazism*, 26–152.

³²⁸ James McClain, *Japan: A Modern History* (New York: Norton, 2002), 439–41; Jonathan Arnason, *Social Theory and Japanese Experience: The Dual Civilization* (New York: Kegan Paul International, 1997), 75–162. For the Russo-Japanese war, see Kanichi Asawaka, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict: Its Causes and Issues* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1972); John Albert White, *The Diplomacy of the Russo-Japanese War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964), 263–329; Shumei Okamoto, *The Japanese Oligarchy and the Russo-Japanese War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), 105–63.

Indochina, British Malaya, Burma, and the Indian subcontinent, fell under the sovereignty of the Europeans and the Americans. The white man controlled Asia, with the exception of Japan.

The militarization of the Japanese government with the coup of 1930 forged the national script on its path toward the Pacific war and Japan's global alliance with European fascism. Japanese fascism aimed, like its European counterparts, to dominate, exploit, and conquer whatever it could for the aggrandizement of the state and the nation. Underlying all fascist ideologies are common social and psychological needs. A nation-state acts with belligerence and brutality only when this is allowed by its political culture. The political culture of all regimes that exhibit highly authoritarian or totalitarian behavior, including pervasive militarism, is a belief system grounded in deep emotional impairment. Fascist behaviors have been, and will be, exhibited by individuals in most cultures. When an individual, in any milieu, acts with deep verbal and or physical aggression, by definition he or she is a fascist. Fascism's most identifiable emotion is intense anger channeled at one's enemies. The emotion of deep, uncontrolled anger must have its source ultimately in serious individual deprivations, including, most especially, the ontological insecurity of a profoundly absent self-esteem. The fascist script channels anger; it externalizes collective emotions of rage and betrayal into organized social and political behavior. In a fascist state, the authoritarian script becomes so prevalent that it seizes control not only of the nation-state but of the culture itself, permeating individual and collective narratives that support the institutional tyranny.³²⁹

Without a political culture and social structure to institutionalize democracy, as understood in Western society, and with a cultural and political system grounded in a history of warfare, internal or external or both, the totalitarian and fascist forms dominate. So in Japan, as in Germany, Spain, Italy, Hungary, Romania, and elsewhere, various strains of fascism attained legitimacy and institutional control. In Japan, as in Nazi Germany, fascism was despotic and genocidal. The Japanese army, acting without the consent of the emperor, attacked and annexed Manchuria in 1931–1932. It did so with the extreme arrogance and brutality one would expect from a fascist society acculturated with a complete lack of empathy or value for foreign civilians of any kind. In Japan, as in Nazi Germany, territorial expansion was designed to acquire control over resources and to enable the expansion of the nation, physically and biologically. The Japanese needed Manchuria's iron ore, coal, and timber. On the vast Chinese coastal plain, Japanese colonists would provide an essential agriculture base for feeding a densely overpopulated mother country. The same was true for Indochina, Malaya, and the East Indies. All were critical regional sources of vital raw materials for the Japanese civilian and military

³²⁹Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie, eds., *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984); W. G. Beasley, *Japanese Imperialism, 1894–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Mark R. Peattie, Ishiwara Kanji and Japan's Confrontation with the West (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975), 141–222; Yoshihisa Tak Matsusaka, *The Making of Japanese Manchuria, 1904–1932* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 390–408.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

sectors. In its pursuit of national strength and greatness through territorial expansion, Japan mixed the scientific-industrial ideology of the West with its native despotism. The attacks on Shanghai and Nanking in 1937 by Japanese forces matched the ferocity of the most vicious genocidal assaults that the Germans committed against Jewish and other European populations during the Second World War.³³⁰

Munich: The Appeasement Script

When Hitler, Chamberlain, and Daladier met in Munich in September 1938, the next European war was less than a year away. The Germans were not quite ready, and Hitler was not supremely confident, but his aggressive negotiation succeeded in convincing the British prime minister and French premier of his sincerity. The personal scripts for these leaders clicked in a dark play of betrayal and duplicity that would mark the collective memory of an entire generation. With Munich, the Western powers focused their entire diplomatic energies on preventing what seemed almost inevitable. Like their leaders, the scripts of the participating powers were now marked for the working out of the infamous drama. In exchange for a promise of peace, Britain and France, with the acquiescence of the distant but powerful United States and the formal agreement of the Soviet Union, gave Hitler the German-speaking areas of Czechoslovakia. This seemed a natural and logical course to the leaders who met with Hitler and his junior ally, Benito Mussolini. If a war could be avoided, it had to be, given the profound inhibitions that public opinion in all the European countries had about a new conflict that could destroy as many lives as the Great War of 1914–1918.³³¹

Hitler did not have the means to fight a two-front war in 1938. He lacked the trained manpower and equipment to attack the Czechoslovakian army in the east and the French and British armies in the west. Yet, his posture of beguiling sincerity deluded Neville Chamberlain into accepting Hitler's promises. The Munich agreement sealed the fate of Czechoslovakia and, in a larger sense, the whole of Europe. Hitler's narrative interfaced with those of his British and French counterparts. The moment that the Anglo-French statement of October 1938 allowed for the dismemberment of one of the successor states to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the national scripts of all the participating European nation-states shifted toward the pan-European civil war. At that moment, fascist ideology gained legitimacy in Europe. Germany had overthrown every aspect of the Versailles system. The technocratic order, structured chiefly by Anglo-American designs in the 1920s, was now completely gone. Hitler had received a bloodless political triumph that

³³⁰Chang, *The Rape of Nanking*, 35–104; Timothy Brook, ed., *Documents on the Rape of Nanking* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999).

³³¹Martin Thomas, "France and the Czechoslovak Crisis," in Igor Lukes and Erik Goldstein, eds., *The Munich Crisis, 1938: Prelude to World War II* (London: Frank Cass, 1999), 122–59, and Erik Goldstein, "Neville Chamberlain, the British Official Mind and the Munich Class," in *ibid.*, 276–92; Parker, *Chamberlain and Appeasement*, 156–99; Telford Taylor, *Munich: The Price of Peace* (New York: Vintage Books, 1980).

would now allow him to prepare for the final crisis of prewar Europe: Germany's demands on Poland.

Appeasement was a complete negation of the West's war against imperial Germany during the First World War. It was a natural result of the trauma that the allied nations had suffered over four years of catastrophic casualties in trench warfare. The Germans had suffered as much or more, not only during that war, but also in all the years that followed the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Of course, Nazism emerged out of the pathos of the trauma in Germany. In Great Britain, France, and the United States, powerful scripts disabled the ability of leaders to challenge Nazism. For the redeemer nation, Franklin Roosevelt could do nothing more than show his open allegiance to the Allies of Western Europe. The ability to respond in the face of evil was controlled by the isolationist framework of the American national script. When the West betrayed Czechoslovakia, the redeemers could only watch with worry and indignation.³³²

The Failures of the Liberal Metascript

Scholars who have explored the institutional and ideological aspects of the interwar period find just as much chaos and irrationality as order and rationality. This generalization includes not only liberal regimes but also Hitler's National Socialism and Stalinism. There was no rationality to Stalin's brutal collectivization, planned famines, and party purges. Despite their overwhelming destructiveness, they occurred throughout his regime with enormous ferocity. "Scientific socialism" was technocratic, but the term does not equate to efficiency or logic. The same was true of Nazism. Hitler's political organization of the Third Reich did not rationalize the use of economic or political resources. There was no effective or coherent organization of Germany's formidable scientific establishment for military production. Some projects, which caught the attention of the Führer, were favored and given highest priority, while others were placed in much less favored positions. The extent of scientific or technical efficiency in any of the totalitarian states was a function of political power and expediency. Similarly, in the United States and other liberal societies, the rational control of society through state planning and/or markets was merely an ideal. Planning in liberal, authoritarian, or totalitarian systems was always a function of a wide range of economic and political interests. In this way, the technocratic script for modernity was incorporated into group, institutional, and national scripts, as designs or mechanisms for action.³³³

By the late 1930s, the Axis countries were expanding with impunity. The Japanese were engaged in full-scale war with Chiang Kai-shek's China. Mussolini had occupied Ethiopia and with Hitler was aiding Franco in his successful counterrevolution against the Spanish republic. Finally, the Nazi war machine was mobilizing rapidly to begin its

³³² Neville, *Appeasing Hitler*, 76–176; *Offner*, *American Appeasement*, 245–80.

³³³ See Ulrich Albrecht, "Military Technology and National Socialist Ideology," in Renneberg and Walker, *Science, Technology and National Socialism*, 88–125, and Kristie Macrakis, "The Ideological Origins of Institutes: The Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft in National Socialist Germany," in *ibid.*, 139–59.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

blitzkrieg wars against Poland, France, the Low Countries, Scandinavia, and subsequently the Soviet Union. The fascists challenged the liberal script for the future of European and world civilization. Even if Hitler hoped to maintain the British Empire, his goal was an Aryan/Teutonic world of racial purity and hierarchy. According to the pathological script of Nazism, there would be a new time on earth when the human race, conveniently divided and stratified by Nazi biology, would rid itself of “inferior” bloodlines. The Nazi order promised German supremacy in Europe and eventually everywhere, with the eradication of Jews, most Slavs, and other undesirable elements, both racial and ideological. It was a vision that Hitler shared with most of his nation and that was indoctrinated into the totalitarian reality of the Third Reich.

With no framework for meaningful collective security in place, the liberal script failed. The liberal technocratic order, born of high hopes and determination to build a new international system with the use of scientific, commercial, and legal constitutional means of control, had no institutional or cultural framework for coping with either the Great Depression or the fascist challenge of the Nazi regime. It was not a question of agency. In the wake of the destruction visited by the Great War, the public in the West lacked any coherent will to wage total war against an irredentist Germany. Hitler, master of demagoguery and political ideology, mobilized German militarism to wage a war of revenge. There was no path to avoid him. The fascist script, a narrative for militarism and, in the case of Germany, industrial genocide, moved Hitler into the center of world history. Of course he was a ruthless destroyer, but like Stalin and other leaders of totalitarian regimes, he was following the dictates of an enraged and pathological psyche. The injured psyche came from the heart of his culture. It was a culture that produced in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries a response to modernity that gave human life little intrinsic value. Hitler brought Germany into war not because of the failure of the French, British, and Poles to respond to his final territorial demands, but because his mission was set many years before in his prison autobiography, *Mein Kampf*. It was “his struggle,” and by executing his plan some fifteen years later, he was fulfilling the terms of his deluded script.³³⁴

The redeemer nation watched as Hitler organized his political system to wage war against Germany’s neighbors and rivals. With a national script that forced him to lie literally on the water’s edge, Roosevelt and his foreign policy establishment could do almost nothing. Hitler skillfully moved his nation toward total war. Without any mandate from the public to go to war, the president could only watch with anxiety as the Nazi war machine attacked and destroyed Poland, occupied half of Scandinavia and the Low Countries, and then, in May and June 1940, invaded and conquered France.

The American history of the Second World War begins with the return of the redeemer nation to internationalism. A country wrapped in the solitude of its own internal dilemmas, in the splendid geographic isolation of North America, could only summon itself after a critical mass had been reached. Only after the Nazi war machine had crushed

³³⁴Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (reprint, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), 607–67; Goldhagen, *Hitler’s Willing Executioners*, 49–128; Clay and Leapman, *Master Race*, 11–39.

the French and occupied Paris, with the rest of Europe threatened, including the survival of Great Britain and her empire, did the redeemer nation rise again to its historical role within the Western script. Even then it was only after the attack on Pearl Harbor that the country became united unequivocally to destroy the fascists and returned the nation to its neo-Wilsonian and technocratic vision for the international system.

Chapter IV

Defending the Free World: The Technocratic War

A common view in the literature suggests that the First and Second World Wars were essentially two parts of the same conflict, a massive conflagration to reorder power in Europe. Quite safely, one can say that the Second World War finished the first one. The European national scripts that collided in 1914 had remained without resolution until a second cataclysmic conflict killed fifty million people, half of them citizens of the Soviet Union. The war brought all of Europe and the European empires, all of East Asia and North America into a sweeping global holocaust involving huge land wars, aerial armadas, and epic naval battles. The Second World War was as vast a conventional conflict as the world seemed capable of. The exigencies of total war maximized the mobilization of national resources. Fighting a worldwide military-scientific-industrial war compelled the industrial and military mobilization of each of the great powers. Over five years, they produced the enormous military forces that thousands of books and films have portrayed in the war's extraordinary literature.³³⁵

The Second World War was a conflict of such sweeping magnitude that no one treatment or synthesis, let alone a chapter in a book, could offer a comprehensive treatment. In six decades of postwar history, many hundreds of distinct war literatures have emerged, not to mention the production of thousands of films and documentaries that have chronicled the conflict. International wars can be viewed from many different national and ideological perspectives. It would be the height of intellectual arrogance to

³³⁵See Keegan, *The Second World War*; Weinberg, *A World at Arms*; Joanna Burke, *The Second World War: A People's History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Research Institute for Military History, *Germany in the Second World War*, 6 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990–2001); Ministry of Defense, *Great Britain, War with Japan*, 6 vols. (London: HMSO, 1995); Iriye, *Power and Culture*; Christopher Thorne, *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain, and the War against Japan, 1941–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Dower, *War without Mercy*.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

claim exclusivity in the value of one narrative over all others. To a degree, every perspective has validity in its own right, though historians are under no obligation to afford it. A conflict of such enormity as the Second World War can be seen and interpreted from the perspectives of the hundreds or even thousands of distinct groups and nationalities that were part of it. No one treatment of the war can encompass the narratives of diplomacy, strategic and operational warfare, domestic politics, and the vast social history of the war, including the Holocaust, and the other tragedies that befell the civilian populations of the combatant nations in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. The idea in this chapter is to maintain and develop the central thesis of this work: to view and interpret the war as a technocratic process in relation to American foreign relations and the international system. The narrative's objective remains to show the leaderships, institutions, and events of the conflict with respect to the theory of modern history as technocratic culture and political economy. The redeemer nation, America, carried the narrative of the war on its own terms into the postwar world.

The Technocratic War

In America, during the 1940s, we find the scripts, knowledge systems, and institutions that formed the result of the Second World War, namely, the reconstitution of the liberal technocratic order. As explored in the previous chapter, the beginning of the war found a conflicted nation-state facing an international system it rejected, but to which it was simultaneously connected. The nation was repelled and attracted, disinterested and committed to a vast international community in desperate need of its intervention. In the end, the script for the second international war of the twentieth century drew the redeemer nation into its role. It would build its war potential with the means of its scientific-industrial base and with the mobilization patterns of its democratic political system. The epistemologies and institutions of the new war would carry forward and indeed create the next stage in the technocratic epoch.³³⁶

Throughout the largest war in human history, rationality and irrationality seemed to test the concepts of leadership and organization. The major protagonists, namely, Hitler, Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill, did not show perfect rationality in their decisions. Hitler's racial state was not rational, nor was Stalin's Soviet Union. Nor were the liberal states rational in the sense of responding coherently to existing conditions in the international or domestic environments. Hitler often ordered his army to do things based on his own intuition or impulse. Over the course of the war, he allowed the Third Reich to spend large amounts of scarce resources on impractical projects. In 1940, with absolute victory within his grasp, he foolishly let the British escape from Dunkirk with four hundred thousand trained soldiers. Fearing that his tanks would become trapped in the uneven terrain of the marshes, Hitler halted his panzer divisions just as they reached the evacuation area for the British army. In 1941, he launched Operation Barbarossa, vainly

³³⁶Hooks, *Forging the Military-Industrial Complex*, 9–56; Sapolsky, *Science and the Navy*, 225–65; Yarmolinsky, *The Military Establishment*, 99–152, 378–84.

confident that the Soviets would collapse in a matter of weeks or months. Later, in the winter of that year, as the Soviets launched a powerful counteroffensive, Hitler encouraged the Japanese to go to war against the United States and honored his pledge to Japan by declaring war four days after Pearl Harbor. In the space of six months, Hitler expanded the war against the British to include both the Soviets and the Americans—a prescription for a two-front war he was bound to lose.

Of course, his adversaries, the Western Allies, belied the same notion of rationality. From his initial rise to power, they appeased Hitler. From the mid-1930s when he tore up the Versailles Treaty and began his huge military expansion, through the infamous Munich agreement, they allowed the most potent enemy of the liberal order to unite his nation. Then, when Hitler struck in 1940 across the Dutch, Belgian, and French frontiers, the Allies were caught with a hopelessly outdated defense plan. Despite the enormous fortifications of the Maginot Line and five million soldiers from throughout its empire, France fell within weeks, and the British raced to evacuate at Dunkirk.³³⁷

The political, military, and economic strategy of all the great powers did not seem to make particular sense in the 1930s and 1940s. It was all more or less crisis management with some pursuit of long-term goals. However, that is how most policy work is done. The strategic rationality that historians find over time reflects the overall scripted nature of the behavior of institutions and nation-states. Hitler, Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill, Mussolini, and Tojo made decisions that directed huge military forces to engage each other in a titanic struggle for world power. Yet institutions structured the narratives, themselves most often conflicted by competing scripts. In the end, there was a broad confluence of motives and outcomes for the war, in which the victors and the losers could reconcile, among themselves, the true (scripted) meaning of the war. At the very highest level of analysis, that of the international system, the war was a technocratic process that destroyed much of the prewar world and replaced it with new institutions and knowledge systems that resonated in the history of postwar America, Europe, and East Asia.³³⁸

³³⁷Kershaw, *Nemesis*, 287–336; Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 731–37, and *The Collapse of the Third Republic: An Inquiry into the Fall of France in 1940* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 1994), 604–779; W. J. R. Gardner, *The Evacuation from Dunkirk: Operation Dynamo, 26 May–4 June 1940* (London: Frank Cass, 2000); Bryan I. Fugate, *Operation Barbarossa: Strategy and Tactics on the Eastern Front, 1941* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1984); Alexander, *How Hitler Could Have Won World War II*, 32–33; Wilhelm Deist et al., *Germany and the Second World War*, vol. 4, *The Attack on the Soviet Union* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 13–25. *Despite striking superiority in tanks as well as comparable strength in airpower between the Luftwaffe and the combined Anglo-French air forces, superior German military strategy overwhelmed the French and British expeditionary force.*

³³⁸Mark Stoler, *Allies and Adversaries: The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Grand Alliance, and U.S. Strategy in World War II* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, 1–24; Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 26–53; Peter Calvocoressi, *Fall Out: World War II and the Shaping of Postwar Europe* (New York: Longman, 1997); David Reynolds, ed., *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe: International Perspectives* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The Second World War visited world affairs with the massive display of the German blitzkrieg against Poland. A million and a half troops of the Wehrmacht, armed with heavy tank divisions, artillery, and ground attack airplanes, launched a devastating coordinated assault across Germany's eastern frontier, forcing Poland's surrender within three weeks. Seventeen days after the German assault, Soviet forces, also mechanized, launched their own invasion of Poland, capturing all territory east of Warsaw and the Vistula River. All of this was part of the secret protocol of the nonaggression pact signed just ten days earlier that created a de facto alliance between opposing totalitarian systems. The Russians observed the Germans warily, knowing full well the ideological predilections of the Nazis to conquer the east, including Russia and the Ukraine, for the fulfillment of lebensraum. In Russian eyes, the liberal world was no more sympathetic to their survival than were the National Socialists, and any way of deterring a massive and deadly German assault was worth pursuing, at least in the short term.³³⁹

In Asia, the interwar system for collective security had collapsed in similar fashion in the late 1930s. Japanese forces drove deep into China, attacking and conquering almost the entire coastal region of the country. They bombed all the major Chinese cities and committed atrocities on the scale of the Nazi invasion of Slavic Europe. The Japanese expansion was fueled as much by strategic fear and insecurity as by imperial ambitions for the "divine" nation.

In Europe, after Munich, Hitler's territorial designs had turned to Poland. With the successful conclusion of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, a de facto alliance to divide Eastern Europe between Germany and the Soviet Union, the Nazis began the Second World War in Europe. Appeasement, a policy which seemed without limit, ended decisively in Europe when France and Great Britain declared war on the Third Reich, on September 3, 1939. An outraged Winston Churchill stated the West's position succinctly: "This is not a question of fighting for Danzig, or fighting for Poland. We are fighting to save the whole world from the pestilence of Nazi tyranny and in defense of all that is sacred to man." The war was nothing else but a defense of human freedom, and he refused to accept any argument to the contrary:

*This is no war of domination or imperial aggrandizement or material gain; no war to shunt any country out of its sunlight and means of progress. It is a war viewed in its inherent quality, to establish, on impregnable rocks, the rights of the individual, and it is a war to establish and revive the stature of man.*³⁴⁰

Western appeasement would end in the Pacific some months before Pearl Harbor, when the United States, Great Britain, and China forced the Japanese to respond to a combination of Chinese military resistance and the denial of essential war materials

³³⁹ Read and Fisher, *The Deadly Embrace*, 92–102; Gorodetsky, *Grand Delusion*, 11–22.

³⁴⁰ Winston Churchill, "War," speech before the House of Commons, September 3, 1939, in *Blood, Sweat and Tears* (New York: Putnam, 1941), 169–70.

through economic embargo. The Japanese, with the support of the European Axis, acted upon a ritualized path to defend their empire. Encircled by the European powers, which had always maintained the racial superiority of Europeans to Asians, they had lost faith in the possibility of securing their East Asian empire through diplomacy. Vulnerable to shortages of food, industrial materials, coal, and oil, the Japanese viewed their predicament as a lone Asian power surrounded by white oppressors. Despite its own assessment that the prospect of fighting and defeating the United States would be difficult, if not impossible, the “divine nation” chose to strike at its enemies.³⁴¹

Up until the day of Pearl Harbor, the military catastrophes in Europe and Asia were not enough to end the redeemer nation’s neutrality. The controlling script of the nation called for the country of George Washington to avoid the mistakes of Woodrow Wilson. As discussed, the isolationist script maintained American exclusion from the world war, even when its enemies, Nazi Germany and imperial Japan, were so clearly defined by the international media as treacherous and profoundly dangerous. Instead, the Roosevelt administration, committed to internationalism but politically strapped to its antithesis, worked diligently at a distinctly biased neutrality and a program of increasing industrial war mobilization. In addition to supplying the Allies with vital war materials by stocking their merchant ships in American ports, the administration had clear objectives for military mobilization. First, the federal government sought to augment America’s severely undermanned and underequipped armed forces for continental defense. With the fall of France and the battle of the Atlantic, time was becoming more precious, and the nation accelerated its conversion to a war footing. After the successful German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941, and the U.S. shoot-on-sight orders against German ships and submarines in September 1941, war planning reached a level of almost certain intervention. The military budget increased dramatically, from less than a billion dollars a year in the mid-1930s to more than ten billion before Pearl Harbor. War appeared imminent, with the Nazis in almost total control of Europe, from the outskirts of Leningrad and Moscow to the Bay of Biscay on the western coast of France. As Japanese military forces were threatening to attack British and American possessions in the Pacific and Southeast Asia, direct American intervention became more and more certain.³⁴²

Among American internationalists, as in the isolationist camp, there were separate perspectives on the prospects for war. Different views, based upon institutional orientations toward the use of force and diplomacy, were found in the Washington establishment. As American participation in the war approached in the fall of 1941, Wilsonian internationalists, such as Cordell Hull and Franklin Roosevelt, believed in the

³⁴¹Michael A. Barnhart, *Japan Prepares for Total War: The Search for Economic Security, 1919–1941* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 237–73; Iriye, *Power and Culture*, 1–35; Thorne, *Allies of a Kind*, 51–53; Waldo Heinrichs, *Threshold of War: Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Entry into World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 180–220.

³⁴²Dallek, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy*, 269–313; Drummond, *The Passing of American Neutrality*, 339–71; Christopher Morley, ed., *Japan’s Road to the Pacific War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

necessity of coalition warfare to coordinate a global strategy against the Axis. The Atlantic Charter of August 1941 incorporated the Wilsonian belief system in collective security to allow the triumph of liberal democracies in a world war against "Hitlerism." Political realists such as Walter Lippmann, who measured foreign policy objectives in strict terms of national interests, also saw no alternative other than to wage war. After the expansion of Nazi strength over the entire European continent, and Axis threats to North Africa and all of East and South Asia, it was plain to professional diplomats and soldiers that the Axis threat to national security could not be defeated without American participation in coalition warfare. Nationalist-oriented army generals and navy admirals saw the defeat of the Axis as a paramount concern. The strategic doctrines of the armed forces, based on the principles of war and the institutional memory of war, viewed future intervention as inevitable.³⁴³

The Second World War also saw the maturation of the new form of internationalism whose outlines had become apparent during the First World War. The intensive war mobilization and strategic planning required during the initial period before Pearl Harbor saw the development of a genuine concept of technocratic internationalism. In a sense, the technocratic approach derived from Wilsonianism and the social science of the New Deal. Its presence was now felt as a distinct form of internationalism in American political culture. The technocratic or managerial ideology for foreign policy developed in parallel with the academic and political culture of America's emerging national security institutions. From the perspective of national planners in the State and War Departments, the strategic threat posed by the Axis required a global war. As war became more and more likely, the large-scale process of war mobilization accelerated under the organizational control of a managerial internationalism. The development of a war economy and culture would ultimately create a new technocratic ideology. The scientific and technological mobilization of American industry and universities, and the integration of this complex task into the military and diplomatic strategies of the government, built not only the wartime national security establishment; it also created the consciousness for the new ideology of postwar globalism. It was an ideology that would define postwar American foreign policy for the next two generations. Now there was an ideological framework and epistemology for internationalism that would shape the nature of U.S. national defense and the general strategic interest of what became known as the "free world."

The informed opinion of the foreign policy elite favored declaring war on the Axis. Yet, the broad outlines of American public opinion still demanded constraints on American participation. Despite the advance of Nazi armies through Europe and the expansion of the Japanese empire through Asia, the American public favored total war only if the Axis openly attacked the United States. Although the Axis seemed everywhere, with the Gestapo ensconced in France, the Low Countries, Denmark,

³⁴³Casey, *Cautious Crusade*, 3–45; Dallek, Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy, 317–405; Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), 393–417; Stoler, *Allies and Adversaries*, 41–83.

Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, the Ukraine, White Russia, and the great Russian heartland; German and Italian armies moving through Greece and French and British North Africa; and Japanese armies through China and Vietnam, the American isolationists still had credibility with public opinion.³⁴⁴ For this reason, Roosevelt enabled the Axis to declare war in part through engineering the multinational ABCD oil embargo against the Japanese empire. The Japanese attack and the subsequent declarations of war by all three Axis powers were triggered by the active role that Roosevelt took in supplying the British and the Soviets with vital war material, and his collaboration with the British and Dutch East Indies authorities to deprive Japan of critical oil supplies. Within minutes of the Japanese carrier assault, the isolationist argument was rendered mute. Within days, the terms for victory involved not only the Pacific but also Berlin.³⁴⁵

The Pearl Harbor attack transformed the conservative isolationist script. Conservative nationalism, insipid and pervasive in American public opinion as an opponent to war, overnight became the harbinger of the nationalist call to arms. Predictably, those political groups oriented toward nationalism and those defined by internationalism united under the banner of national defense and Americanism. The internationalist script, whose public ideology was carried by the White House, the New York Times, and the New York Herald Tribune, as well as millions of passionate believers in the internationalist creed and the threat of German and Japanese militarism, organized American national institutions for war. The spectacle of Nazi troops marching victoriously through the Arc de Triomphe in central Paris had galvanized East Coast internationalists in the spring and summer of 1940. Pearl Harbor, however, with the deaths of three thousand American seamen, was military dramaturgy of larger-than-life proportions. The Japanese coordinated their assaults all over the Pacific. As several hundred crack Japanese combat pilots attacked Hawaii, other forces engaged perfectly timed strikes against American and British forces in the western Pacific. They attacked the American Philippines and Guam and gained stunning victories there and in British Malaya, Singapore, and the Dutch East Indies. Yet, the script had turned. Pearl Harbor united the nation like no other event ever could have. The conflicted American political script, which tied the hands of Franklin Roosevelt, turned that morning in Hawaii when Japanese Zeros torpedoed American war ships, destroying the aging and nearly obsolete American Pacific battleship fleet.³⁴⁶

³⁴⁴Casey, *Cautious Crusade*, 40–44.

³⁴⁵Peter Wetzler, *Hirohito and War: Imperial Tradition and Military Decision Making in Prewar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1998), 12–60; Michael Gannon, *Pearl Harbor Betrayed* (New York: Henry Holt, 2000), 69–92; Geoffrey Perret, *Days of Sadness, Years of Triumph: The American People 1939–1945* (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, 1973), 203–70; William L. O'Neill, *A Democracy at War: America's Fight at Home and Abroad in World War II* (New York: Macmillan, 1993), 129–52; Robert Ketchum, *The Borrowed Years, 1938–1941: America on the Way to War* (New York: Random House, 1989), 782–96.

³⁴⁶Stanley Weintraub, *Long Day's Journey into War: December 7, 1941* (New York: Truman Talley Books, 1991); Denys Smith, *America and the Axis War* (New York: Macmillan, 1942); Fletcher Pratt, *America and Total War* (New York: Smith & Durrell, 1941); Ralph Ingersoll, *America Is Worth Fighting For* (New York: Bobbs Merrill, 1941); H. S. Commager et al., *America*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The Japanese assault, so stunning in its magnitude, made academic the sophisticated attacks on the viability of American intervention. The rational arguments of both liberal and conservative anti-interventionists suddenly became moot. At once, the divergent American ideological systems for international relations coalesced into a complex mental universe. In the technocratic age, world war would be fought with increasing levels of organizational and technical complexity. The country would build its wartime institutions, its national security state, with the epistemologies for the new technocratic internationalism. The war would be won through the coalition warfare of the Grand Alliance; with the political, economic, and military mobilization of American society; and through the inspiration and psychological redoubt that the war against fascism could provide. For the redeemer nation, the Second World War symbolically cleansed the country. Through religion and nationalism, the war would restore the nation's native Protestant faith in its predestined role in world history.

Like the First World War, the Second subscribed to the same pattern as virtually all of the international wars in modern history. The massive conflict was a complex interaction between the "imagined communities" of nation-states. In total, the Second World War stretched from the Arctic Circle north of the Norwegian coast to the fringes of the Japanese empire in the Solomon Islands archipelago. Yet, as with all other historical and contemporary international conflict systems, it involved the working out of national scripts. Scripts turned, as they did with the fall of France in June 1940. All over the map of the conflict, leaderships changed with the circumstances. In Great Britain, Winston Churchill was chosen to face the Nazi assault, just as in France the collapsing French resistance rallied around Charles De Gaulle. The epic nature of the conflict, with its profound disasters and triumphs, changed the collective identity of nations. Collective narratives were transmogrified, emboldened, diminished, or destroyed by the Second World War. In the war between the Grand Alliance and the Axis, nation-states and the international system were transformed, politically and institutionally. Victory for Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt left a new bipolar system. The United States, undisputed leader of the West, supplanted both Great Britain and France as the ultimate arbiter of the liberal technocratic script. The German and Japanese nations were destroyed and rebuilt in the image of their occupiers. The liberal postwar republics of the conquered fascist states would become near diametric opposites of their predecessor regimes. Militarism was all but eliminated from West German and Japanese cultures. Constitutionally, these nations would remain noninterventionist, unable to wage war again, politically or psychologically.

In the end, the postwar world was a partial fulfillment of the liberal technocratic script. The new order for the world would be peaceful but would be dominated by the long-term and dangerous military rivalry between the victors. The liberal technocratic order survived and destroyed the fascist/Nazi alternative, albeit thanks to its wartime alliance with the Soviet Union. The "American Century," the term coined by Henry Luce

Organizes to Win the War: A Handbook on the American War Effort (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1942).

of Time magazine, was now contemporaneously and historically correct.³⁴⁷ The war, catastrophic for Central and Eastern Europe as well as East Asia, transferred the mantle of globalism from the British and French empires to the United States. The technocratic world, a civilization defined by machines and machine culture, had established itself as a utopian ideal in Western culture long before the Second World War. Now technocracy would be embraced by the two superpowers in their inexorable military and industrial competitions. The centralized systems for the production of war technology would serve as a prototype for the long-term strategic development of a technocratic world. The technocratic would be at the heart of the liberal internationalist fusion of science, capitalism, and engineering. Technocracy had always been at the center of the Marxist vision of the future and, under Stalin and his successors, the technocratic concept, albeit monstrously flawed in their hands, would project the Soviet script to the end of the Soviet Union.

Internationally, the redeemer nation would rebuild Europe and East Asia, using its surfeit of capital and military power. It would do so with the inspiration of a self-consciously Christian nation that the mid-century theologian Reinhold Niebuhr captured in his early Cold War work. In technocratic terms, the script would forge political economy and strategic security, albeit with varying degrees of efficacy. With its dominant military power and its informal empire of civil society, namely, international business and the plenitude of American cultural exports, the “Children of Light” would establish the postwar institutional framework. As they did so, emergent in the 1950s and 1960s would be a technocratic international system: corporate, scientific, and militarized, and designed to control, expand, innovate, and quantify human and physical systems. In the West, it would be American institutions in concert with erstwhile Second World War enemies and allies, European and Japanese, that would engage in the vast production of Cold War intellectual technologies. In the Soviet bloc, through socialist technocratic means, Soviet central planners hoped to match and then exceed the scientific and industrial potential of the American state. Yet, the scripts would never cooperate. The Americans would conquer the moon, Germany, and Japan, but would lose in Vietnam and elsewhere. The Soviets, victorious in the war at an impossible cost, would ultimately lose all. The spoils of the war would last only a generation or two. Then the political, economic, and technocratic dimensions of power would settle the argument that the Second World War had begun.

³⁴⁷Warren Kimball, “The Atlantic Charter: ‘With All Deliberate Speed,’” in Douglas Brinkley and David R. Facey-Crowther, eds., *The Atlantic Charter* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1994), 84–114; Michael C. Adams, *The Best War Ever: America and World War II* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 1–19; Perret, *Days of Sadness, Years of Triumph*, 410–43; Theodore A. Wilson, *The First Summit: Roosevelt and Churchill at Placentia Bay, 1941* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969), 149–75.

The Metascript: The “Struggle for Power and Peace”

The “struggle for power and peace” was the subtitle of Hans Morgenthau’s classic realist tome on international politics, *Politics among Nations*. It was written during the Second World War, while the author, a young scholar, taught at various American universities, most notably the University of Chicago. Published in 1948, the work encapsulated a European scholar’s worldview of international relations during and immediately after the conflict. Indeed, its argument, summarized in its title and subtitle, suggests the script for the international system since its modern birth in the seventeenth century. According to Morgenthau, political power on all levels of human association, including international relations, was “a psychological relationship between those who exercise it and those over whom it is exercised.”³⁴⁸ Psychological power, then, was coterminous with political power. To a world audience of the 1930s and 1940s, the speeches of Adolf Hitler exemplified this equation very starkly. It was almost as if the power of the Third Reich exuded from the breath of the Führer. In a matter of less than a decade, the psychological power of Hitler became the political and strategic power of German blitzkriegs and wolf packs. Through shortwave radio, the voice of the dictator carried the palpable strength of fascism everywhere in the world.

Ultimately, power, defined by psychological or political constructs, had its material basis in military capabilities. The goal of all forms of imperialism, whether on the right or the left of the political spectrum, was the projection of political control. Yet, historically, the essential source of that power was not political, but was determined by military force. Whether the objectives of a state were economic or territorial expansion or cultural hegemony, military force was “the most important material factor in the political power of a nation.”³⁴⁹ Echoing the views of an entire generation of historians and social scientists who had seen two world wars in their lifetimes, Morgenthau viewed conflict in universal, even biological terms:

It cannot be denied that throughout historic time, regardless of social, economic, and political conditions, states have met each other in contests for power. Even though anthropologists have shown that certain primitive peoples seem to be free from the desire for power, nobody has yet shown how their state of mind and the conditions under which they live can be recreated on a worldwide scale so as to eliminate the struggle for power from the international scene. It would be useless and even self-destructive to free one or the other of the peoples of the earth from the desire for power while leaving it extant in others. If the desire for power cannot be

³⁴⁸Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Knopf, 1948), 14.

³⁴⁹Ibid., 15

*abolished everywhere in the world, those who might be cured would simply fall victims to the power of others.*³⁵⁰

The metascript for the Second World War was indeed a struggle for power on an almost unimaginable scale. Global war required communication and transportation systems for military operations that spanned the circumference of the earth. The Allies fulfilled the promise of the technological revolutions of the industrial age. Around the world, Anglo-American military planning coordinated campaigns of air, naval, and land forces. Simultaneously, the Soviet and German armies were engaged in the greatest land war in history, stretching the breadth of the Russian and Ukrainian plains. It was a wholly massive, global military conflict that contested control over most of the earth's surface. More so than any other war, including both its predecessor, "the war to end all wars," and its successor, the Cold War, the Second World War was, as Churchill spoke on the first day of war, a struggle, starkly, for the destiny of human civilization. Historians may question the global intentions of Adolf Hitler and his allies. Hitler's original objectives may be interpreted as not global but only continental in scope. Indeed, in the case of the Japanese, most sources agree that the leaders did not believe they could win a war against the United States.³⁵¹

However, the metascripts for civilizations transcend all individuals and nation-states. They are grand collective narratives that move over centuries and millennia, connecting historical cultures, technologies, and physical geography. The metascript for the West and for the international system in the modern period was and remains a complex communication system linking many separate types of scripts, at different levels of society, in processes largely hidden from contemporary observation. During the Second World War, the agents for the script had great historical prominence. Political and military leaders such as Hitler, Stalin, Churchill, Roosevelt, De Gaulle, Hirohito, Göring, Rommel, Patton, and Eisenhower linked national scripts in various forms of political dramaturgy. In its totality, the war's metascript had consequences of historical and worldwide importance.³⁵²

³⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 17.

³⁵¹Winston Churchill, "Blood, Toil, Sweat and Tears," remarks in *House of Commons*, May 13, 1940, in Robert Rohes James, ed., *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches, 1897–1963*, 6 vols. (New York: Chelsea House, 1974), 6:6218–20. Regarding Hitler's war aims, it has been suggested that Hitler wanted to share the world with the British Empire, which he admired. See Keegan, *The Second World War*, 128. Kershaw has emphasized Hitler's stated plans for eastern expansion and the creation of a greater Aryan homeland incorporating Slavic Europe. See Kershaw, *Nemesis*, 517. In contrast, William Shirer sees Hitler's ravings in *Mein Kampf* for German domination of the world as a proper discernment of German history: "Nazism and the Third Reich, in fact, were but a logical continuation of German history" (Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, 90). See also Herbert P. Bix, *Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan* (New York: HarperCollins, 2000), 439; Iriye, *Power and Culture*, 88–97.

³⁵²The metascript is something that conservative realists and world systems theorists can agree upon. The realist concept is more literary and historical, with the narrative clearly embedded in the

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Like that of the First World War, the metascript for the Second tested the cohesion and organization of the great powers. It drew upon the depths of human resources and political will among all the combatants, because the war was about national survival just as much as about global hegemony. Its dramaturgy, tragic and brutal, brought the narratives of the combatants into an epic struggle for the ideological and material control of global civilization.³⁵³ Indeed, the whole concept of world power, as understood in the West by Great Britain in the nineteenth century and earlier by Spain and France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was changing rapidly. It changed even as Hitler came to conquer most of Europe, while the British Commonwealth and the Soviet Union fought desperately to survive his onslaught. Before and after the war, the concept of empire was under assault from native movements throughout the colonial world. The metascript drove industrialization, secularization, and the rise of Western-educated elites in the colonial regions. With the destruction of colonial authorities by the Axis, the whole idea of imperialism, as understood by Europeans, became a hopeless anachronism.³⁵⁴ The modernization process of the twentieth century was working feverishly to produce new forms of technological modernity. The Europeans were bringing international commerce, including commercial aircraft, ocean liners, merchant ships, railroads, and telegraphic, radio, and telephony communications. Newspapers, journals, and scientific and literary books, as well as university education for native elites, were being brought to the far reaches of the British and French empires. The inclusion of the colonies in the war against the Axis powers accelerated the changes already begun. Ultimately, the huge cost in lives and money forced the issues of dependency and cost of empire onto the table of the war's victors. With the birth of the United Nations under the anti-imperial ideology of the Roosevelt administration, colonialism would be seen as temporary and finite.³⁵⁵

"personality" of the country. See Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations*, 1–15; Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, 137–67. World systems theorists, in contrast, view a world design or script as a sociological phenomenon reflecting the laws of social development. See Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, 1–11. The political anthropology of culture is discussed in Geertz, *Local Knowledge, Negara, and "Ideology as a Cultural System,"* in *Interpretation of Cultures*, 193–233; Raymond Williams, *The Sociology of Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 87–138.

³⁵³Harold J. Laski, *The Strategy of Freedom: An Open Letter to American Youth* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941); James Reston, *Prelude to Victory* (New York: Pocket Books, 1942).

³⁵⁴Roy Dougleas, *World Crisis and British Imperial Decline* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 124–38; P. J. Cain and A. G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: Crisis and Deconstruction, 1914–1990* (New York: Longman, 1993); Max Beloff, *Dream of Commonwealth, 1921–1942* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1989); Hoopes and Brinkley, *FDR and the Creation of the U.N.*, 118–20; Louis Emmerij, Richard Jolly, and Thomas G. Weiss, *Ahead of the Curve? U.N. Ideas and Global Challenges* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 16–42.

³⁵⁵At the U.N.'s founding, British resistance dulled the anticolonial objectives of American and Soviet delegations for the U.N. charter. Nonetheless, the end of colonialism was well in sight by 1945. Robert C. Hilderbrand, *Dumbarton Oaks: The Origins of the United Nations and the Search*

In Western Europe and North America, the Second World War became a siren call to the defense of the liberal world order. Liberalism, which Americans such as President Harry Truman simply called “freedom,” would be fought for with the combined resources of industrialized societies determined to survive a war that promised its losers only unconditional surrender. There seemed to be an inherent contradiction between the way the war was fought and the concept of democratic liberalism as the generally accepted paradigm for liberty. Total war was sweeping across the Pacific, Asia, the Middle East, and Europe as it brought the issues of liberty face to face with annihilation. If the Germans attempted to destroy Great Britain, the British were equally determined to do the same to Germany. Whatever power had to be harnessed, either side was willing to do it, if possible. So, Winston Churchill had no qualms about unleashing firebombs on German cities, nor were Americans in any way conflicted over the napalm incineration of Tokyo or the nuclear bombings of Japan. The atrocities of the Axis powers were far beyond the pale of wartime killings. A fundamental principle of total war is simple to understand. That is, absolute war is fought with all available means to achieve a durable political objective. Whether historians look at the courage of individual soldiers or the huge weapons systems of continental-size armies, the forces of total war are obedient to the principles of war, most notably those defined by the military theorist Clausewitz. In the end, when Berlin fell to the Soviet army in May 1945 and the Japanese surrendered on the American battleship Missouri in September of that year, the immediacy of Allied presence on the ground settled all outstanding issues with their adversaries.³⁵⁶

The metascript assigned national leaders such as Roosevelt and Churchill, as well as Hitler and Stalin and many others, to serve as oracles, receptors, and interpreters of the world war. The speeches and statements of the leaders rang with the truths of the essential objectives that defined the cultural scripts of nation-states. The agency of the wartime leaders defined the scripts for their nations in an hour of supreme crisis. Hitler defined Germany’s destiny, which was Armageddon. Stalin served the destiny of the Soviet Union, which was to rise to superpower status but with the enormous suffering of the Second World War and the totalitarianism of Stalin’s police state. For Churchill, the script was ultimate British victory but at a price. For the French, it was nearly the same. General Charles De Gaulle, the leader of the Free French, defined French honor and nationhood with his call to arms against the Nazi occupier. The script he carried into exile restored French nationality at the defeat of German arms on French soil in 1944. It was not the only script for France, but it was the one that emerged in the narrative of the war

for Postwar Security (*Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990*), 170–76; Evan Luard, *A History of the United Nations*, 2 vols. (*New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1982–1989*).

³⁵⁶Roy Jenkins, *Churchill: A Biography* (*New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2001*), 777–78; Clive Ponting, *Churchill* (*London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1994*); Edwin P. Hoyt, *Inferno: The Firebombing of Japan, March 9–August 15, 1945* (*Lanham, MD: Madison Books, 2000*); Michael S. Sherry, *The Rise of American Air Power: The Creation of Armageddon* (*New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987*), 256–356.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

as Allied forces, forged into a massive military machine, defeated the Germans and brought De Gaulle to power.³⁵⁷

Soon after, it was De Gaulle's agency that compelled the United States and Great Britain to enable France to recover the international position it enjoyed prior to its ignominious defeat in 1940. To the extent that French national revival restored a semblance of order to the postwar colonial world and established France once more as an economic and military power in a noncommunist Europe, it fit into the larger script of the Western Alliance. The metascript wanted to preserve the liberal technocratic order. Through the Grand Alliance, it forced the destruction of fascism. The new world would adopt yet another metascript—that of a bipolar Cold War. However, that narrative was not preordained by the outcome of the Second World War. Rather, the Western metascript had remained adaptive over many centuries. International wars of all kinds require the creation of metascripts. Nation-states, like individuals, do not engage in fateful acts without a predetermined schema or a script, a probable path or behavior.

During the Second World War the Western metascript took the concept of power and converted it into the concrete forms that we now remember. Global power is relative to historical time and place. It has always been a multidimensional concept. To paraphrase Hans Morgenthau, national power is expressed in military, political, social, and cultural spheres of influence. Winning a global war required the same attributes as winning any lesser conflict. Although the presumption of most military theorists is that military power is well determined by technological means, that superiority cannot guarantee victory. In the last analysis, even in the age of technocratic combat, virtually all wars of any size are reduced to questions of comparative political will. In the conflagration that killed tens of millions, it was the Allies who mustered not only more resources, through determined organization and mass mobilization, but also the indomitable will to defeat Nazi and Japanese totalitarianism. In the end, as we all know, the winners vanquished the losers completely. The losers not only lost but also were forced to reconstruct their societies in ways that ended, unambiguously, any chance of return to the fascist regimes that initiated the global war.³⁵⁸

For the second time in half a century, the struggle for power reordered Europe and the international system. The conflict in effect "solved" the German question in Europe and the Japanese question in Asia. It also ended the practical continuation of a Eurocentric world. Great Britain and France and the lesser empires of the Netherlands and Belgium

³⁵⁷A. W. DePorte, *De Gaulle's Foreign Policy, 1944–1946* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 16–101; Jean Lacouture, *De Gaulle*, 2 vols. (London: Collins Harvill, 1990), 1:491–591; Paul-Marie de La Gorce, *De Gaulle* (Paris: Perrin, 1999); Brian Crozier, *De Gaulle* (New York: Scribner, 1973), 295–348.

³⁵⁸Stephen E. Ambrose, *Citizen Soldiers: The U.S. Army from the Normandy Beaches to the Bulge to the Surrender of Germany, June 7, 1944–May 7, 1945* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998); Sun Tzu, *The Art of War* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1983); Peter Tsouras, *The Great Patriotic War: An Illustrated History of Total War: The Soviet Union and Germany, 1941–1945* (London: Greenhill Books, 1992).

would soon relinquish their roles of hegemony. No longer would the colonial empires of Europe maintain the formal white domination of a largely nonwhite world. Instead, lesser forms of domination, economic and cultural, would continue. Nonetheless, the reordering of global power scripted a new international system. In the immediate future, the informal empire of the United States and the vast corporate apparatus of the Soviet Union would establish a bipolar international system based upon counterbalanced nuclear arsenals. Although the United Nations would establish a new international community inclusive of new nation-states, the strategic position of the world revolved around the permanent national security regimes in the United States and the Soviet Union and their allies. An essential part of the metascript established the postwar technocratic culture of military and scientific technologies. The Cold War would involve the development of the technocratic power of each nation.

The metascript challenged twentieth-century liberalism with its antithesis and forced its political mobilization. When Harry Truman was given notice that the vast scientific effort to build a nuclear bomb had succeeded, he remarked in his diary that though it was the most “terrible weapon” ever devised, he was grateful that the Americans had the bomb and not the Nazis or the Soviets.³⁵⁹ The war had forged institutional and ideological forces within society to build the warfare state and the military culture for total war. Liberal societies forced the same psychological mobilization as totalitarian ones to defend themselves. The political theater of the war was displayed in every form of mid-twentieth-century media, from print to radio to Hollywood movies to news films.³⁶⁰ Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt, icons of the mid-twentieth century, opposed the nemesis incarnated in the agency of Adolf Hitler. To do so, they made common cause with Stalin, agent of Soviet absolutism and totalitarianism. The political titans of the Grand Alliance instructed their publics with the determined rhetoric of total war. They informed their audiences that the fate of the world rested with them, and that the Nazi onslaught had to be defeated through any and all measures. In large part, the propaganda was entirely true. Along the vast military frontiers of the Second World War, tens of millions of common people died. They fell as foot soldiers by the millions in the cities, forests, and plains of European Russia; they died in Poland, the Balkans, and all over the rest of Central and Eastern Europe. Millions died of starvation and mass executions in Europe and in Asia. Many hundreds of thousands went down with their merchant or

³⁵⁹J. Samuel Walker, *Prompt and Utter Destruction: Truman and the Use of Atomic Bombs against Japan* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 60–61, 91–94. *The best revisionist account, by Gar Alperovitz, suggests that Truman’s motives were more complex. In Alperovitz’s interpretation, the bomb was the first demonstrable act of containing Soviet expansion after the collapse of the Axis powers. See Gar Alperovitz, The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb and the Architecture of an American Myth* (New York: Knopf, 1995), 501–61.

³⁶⁰Thomas Doherty, *Projections of War: Hollywood, American Culture, and World War II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Robert Fyne, *The Hollywood Propaganda of World War II* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1994).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

combat ships, or in the thousands of fighters and bombers destroyed in the conflict.³⁶¹ The war was fought in the flesh, with blood and the deadly power of mid-twentieth-century weapons, and in other ways; especially over the global communications medium of radio waves, the conflict was fought with words. In the end, after the wholesale destruction of much of Eastern and Central Europe as well as East Asia, the political will of the Allies won. Certainly, more resources, manpower, and advanced technological weapons systems were essential for victory. Still, the will of the worldwide antifascist coalition, itself an artifact of modern communication systems,³⁶² was an equal or greater factor in victory.

The strategic dimensions of the war were orchestrated by massive global logistical and operational tasks. The sheer firepower of the Anglo-American naval and air forces made the D-day invasion possible; and the enormous five-hundred-division Soviet army (mechanized in part with American production), through numbers and enormous fire power, would slowly roll back and destroy the German army on its eastern front. Yet, the material components of victory were always underlaid by the ideology of human freedom. Even the toughest of military commanders must realize the quintessential importance of political will. To secure the indomitable will of the people, the leaders of the alliance had to exude the essential ideology of the West. The promise of a “free” world, implied in the Atlantic Charter signed by him and Churchill on board a British warship in 1941, and envisioned by Franklin Roosevelt in his Four Freedoms speech of 1944, and , was a galvanizing force behind the victory of Allies.³⁶³

Once more, the metascript was working out the struggle for power within the international system. In Franklin Roosevelt, and in the office of the American president, the redeemer nation was given the task of fulfilling its historical script on a global scale. Roosevelt, the agent of the American script, sought not only to overcome Nazi Germany and imperial Japan, but to institutionalize the liberal technocratic order worldwide. At near mid-century, encapsulated within American ideology was a well-developed scientific-capitalist and democratic ethos; in the depths of total war and mass mobilization throughout domestic society, American internationalism became a forceful global organizing system. The Western metascript, derived from the cultural elements of its beginnings in what S. N. Eisenstadt called the “Axial civilizations” of near antiquity (500 B.C. to A.D. 100), shaped the genesis of the reformation and the founding of the North American Protestant culture that became the United States. The redeemer nation opposed the Third Reich as it challenged the West, and the Japanese empire in Asia as it did the same, because of what its name implies. To redeem the West, it had to defeat its deadly counternarratives: fascism, National Socialism, imperialism, and Marxism-

³⁶¹Weinberg, *A World at Arms*, 894–920; Davies, *Europe*, 998–1058, 1329.

³⁶²Stoler, *Allies and Adversaries*, 123–45; Robin Edmonds, *The Big Three: Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin in Concord and Conflict* (New York: Norton, 1991).

³⁶³Theodore A. Wilson, “The First Summit: FDR and the Riddle of Personal Diplomacy,” in Wilson, *The First Summit*, 1–31; Douglas Brinkley and David R. Facey-Crowther, eds., *The Atlantic Charter* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1994), 226–27.

Leninism. American political will mobilized quickly and deeply, building the vast military-industrial complex it needed to harness every available military and scientific means for winning the war.³⁶⁴

National Security State

While the cultural, psychological, and epistemological foundations of world war were essential to its genesis, the institutional systems that sustained it were of equal importance. The institutions that had shaped the Great War were expanded in size and complexity with the Second World War. The First World War had established a national security state in terms of the institutional and intellectual concepts that defined national defense in 1917–1918. It was a limited concept because no permanent institutional systems or large body of technocratic knowledge was envisioned by American statecraft. Rather, national and global security on the scale of that of later periods in U.S. international history was simply not constructed before, during, or after the Great War.³⁶⁵ Overall, most historians of the American military-industrial complex, have referenced the “national security state” during the Cold War. Indeed, much has been and will be written about the machinations of giant bureaucracies that created the American Cold War. Yet, before the postwar institution building occurred, the national security state was a coherent concept during the Second World War. Technocratic epistemologies are necessarily related to the operations of technocratic institutions. In most ways, institutions and knowledge systems, in the context of mid- and late twentieth-century U.S. history, were coterminous. This meant that nuclear technology, as a body of expert knowledge, was inextricably a product of the scientific and engineering institutions that developed this rarefied form of intellectual thought.³⁶⁶ Human knowledge and institutions are inherently codependent in the technocratic context of advanced industrialized nations. The Second World War built large bodies of knowledge and institutions whose legacies are found in the profound developments of the postwar period.

Throughout the twentieth century, institutional systems were linked inextricably and causally with epistemological systems. The great power script required the codevelopment of the organizations and ideas that enabled the projection of power upon the international community. Technocratic war requires technocratic states capable of

³⁶⁴S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., *The Origins and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986).

³⁶⁵Cuff, War Industries Board, 148, 190; Paul A. C. Koistinen, *Planning War, Pursuing Peace: The Political Economy of American Warfare, 1920–1939* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998), 211–304.

³⁶⁶Lillian Huddleston, *Critical Assembly: A Technical History of Los Alamos during the Oppenheimer Years, 1943–1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Ronald L. Kathren, Jerry B. Gough, and Gary T. Benefiel, eds., *The Plutonium Story: The Journals of Professor Glenn T. Seaborg, 1939–1946* (Columbus, OH: Battelle Press, 1994); James G. Hershberg, James B. Conant: *Harvard to Hiroshima and the Making of the Nuclear Age* (New York: Knopf, 1993), 112–234.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

sustaining the managerial systems for military conflict. The essential nature of the Second World War compelled the expansion and professionalization not only of logistics, but also of the entire war planning process. In all the major combatant nations, departments of civilian and military institutions were related to the production of technocratic knowledge and the strategic context of the global war. Huge research projects on weapons systems were undertaken by all the powers. In addition to engineering work on improving conventional weapons systems, chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons research was carried out by British, Soviet, German, and Japanese scientists and engineers.³⁶⁷ As we have seen with the Manhattan Project, the production of weapons systems and the “superweapons” that all sides hoped would turn the tide of war involved considerable resources. Weapons themselves, however, were only part of the technocratic system for war. In institutional forms, the functional design for technocratic war was duplicated by all of the combatant nations. Consistent with the organizational principles of machine civilization, bureaucratic rationality imposed itself on the belligerents. The Americans, the British, the Soviets, the Germans, and the Japanese all had well-developed and fully staffed institutions for the development of war strategy, intelligence, diplomacy, propaganda, logistics, and military production. The Grand Alliance coordinated not only the vast armies of the three powers, but the extensive production systems, intelligence, and technological research for the support of international coalition warfare. The national security structures of the respective allies were huge and pervasive domestic systems that extended around the world through the collaboration between the military commands and diplomatic corps of the respective partners.³⁶⁸

This process of institutionalization became a characteristic of the successor conflict, the Cold War, whose origins lie in the unresolved issues and the debris of the Second

³⁶⁷Roger Ford, *Germany's Secret Weapons of World War II* (Staplehurst, UK: Spellmount, 2000); Tom Schachtman, *Wizards at War: The Use and Abuse of Science and Technology in World War II* (New York: Morrow, 2002); David Zimmerman, *Top Secret Exchange: The Tizard Mission and the Scientific War* (Buffalo, NY: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 130–53; Brian Johnson, *The Secret War* (New York: Methuen, 1978); Donald H. Avery, *The Science of War: Canadian Scientists and Allied Military Technology during the Second World War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 41–227; Per F. Dahl, *Heavy Water and the Wartime Race for Nuclear Energy* (Philadelphia: Institute of Physics, 1999); Powers, *Heisenberg's War*; Henshall, *The Nuclear Axis*; Mark Walker, *Nazi Science: Myth, Truth, and the German Atomic Bomb* (New York: Plenum Press, 1995); Jeremy Bernstein, *Hitler's Uranium Club: The Secret Recordings at Farm Hall* (New York: Copernicus Books, 2001).

³⁶⁸Janos Radvanyi, ed., *Psychological Operations and Political Warfare in Long-Term Strategic Planning* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1990); Paul Myron Anthony, *Psychological Warfare* (Washington, DC: Infantry Journal Press, 1948); Daniel Lerner, *Psychological Warfare against Nazi Germany: The Sykewar Campaign, D-Day to VE-Day* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1949), 164–284; Nelson, *Arsenal of Democracy*; Hans-Erich Volkmann, “The National Socialist Economy in Preparation for War,” in *Research Institute for Military History, Germany in the Second World War*, 1:160–372.

World War. Within just a few years of the fall of Hitler's Berlin bunker and the destruction of the Japanese empire, a new militarized peace had descended upon the world. The huge direction of resources toward the war had created an entirely new generation of weapons, as well as skilled pools of industrial labor. The institutions that emerged seemingly overnight during the war would be reconstituted after the war settlement period, as a result of the new international crisis of American-Soviet relations. In the end, the national security state would define American foreign relations like no other concept until it reached its own denouement during the Vietnam conflict.

War Production

In the hydrocarbon and steel age of the Second World War, military power was related to resources and industrial systems. Resources were very scarce for the Axis powers, impeding their ability to sustain offensive operations. In contrast, the vast resources of the British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union, and the United States supplied enormous advantages. The effective conversion of civilian industries to military mass production allowed the Grand Alliance to create the most mechanized, mobile, and heavily defended armed forces in history. The German, Japanese, and Italian war industries were not inadequate. Rather, as the war progressed, military production increased among the Axis countries, peaking quite late in 1944.³⁶⁹ This took place despite the massive attacks by Allied bombers. Through desperate measures, and in Germany this meant the use of eight million slave laborers, the Axis powers sustained and increased their military production in spite of daily bombing attacks and the loss of reliable sources of raw materials. Only in the last year of the war, when industrial areas in Germany were on the brink of occupation, was production disrupted in a material way. In Japan, the successful destruction of its supply lines down the western Pacific left the country on the brink of starvation and its factories useless. The firebombing of Japanese cities did not end the Japanese war industry, but the loss of all essential raw materials from outside sources destroyed the ability of the Japanese to replace what it was losing on the battlefield.³⁷⁰

The Soviet Union fared better than the Axis countries, under the most desperate circumstances. Despite the occupation of two-thirds of European Russia by the Wehrmacht, the Russians were able to transport most of their heavy industry east to the Ural Mountains. The day the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union, Stalin ordered the

³⁶⁹Mark Harrison, *Accounting for War: Soviet Production, Employment and the Defence Burden, 1940–1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 58–127; Sir Alec Cairncross, *Planning in Wartime: Aircraft Production in Britain, Germany and the USA* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1991); Edward R. Zilbert, *Albert Speer and the Nazi Ministry of Arms: Economic Institutions and Industrial Production in the German War Economy* (London: Associated University Presses, 1981); Mark Harrison, ed., *The Economics of World War II: Six Great Powers in International Comparison* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 152, 229.

³⁷⁰Jerome B. Cohen, *Japan's Economy in War and Reconstruction* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 107–9.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

dismantling of fifteen hundred armament factories, which would be transported east to the Urals and beyond. Responding to the national emergency, the Soviets were able to save most of the factories that lay in the path of the Nazis. With generous aid from the United States and Great Britain, Soviet war production increased dramatically throughout the war, by far outdistancing that of Germany. Late into the war, thoroughly mechanized Soviet armored divisions attacked and destroyed German divisions that still relied on animal power for their supply lines and moving heavy artillery. The statistics for mass production are revealing. In all categories, Allied war production exceeded Axis output by factors of several fold. U.S. war production included three hundred thousand aircraft, more than one hundred aircraft carriers, more than a million military vehicles, and hundreds of thousands of tanks and field artillery pieces. American production not only supported a combined military strength that peaked at twelve million troops, but was also a substantial contributor to the combined strengths of all other Allied forces, including the British Commonwealth and the Soviet Union. The American strengths in overall factors of production, as well as the most highly developed use of mass production technologies in manufacturing, supported the other American strengths in diplomatic, military, and scientific fields. In the end, the Axis powers were outgunned and outmanned by the Grand Alliance. Without truly brilliant strategy and political mobilization, the Axis powers were doomed by the technocratic means and political mobilization of the U.S.-Soviet-British alliance.³⁷¹

War Epistemologies

The war epistemologies were organized into cohesive elements of technological power. Technocratic epistemologies transcend weapons and military staff. They are integral and transcendent aspects of technologically based war. The state was challenged and ultimately transformed by the scientific and industrial environment of modern warfare. To exploit that environment, the epistemological systems of the state, broadly defined, were mobilized on all sides to produce the weapons systems and organizational and tactical doctrines that were critical to operational success on the battlefield. The essential nature of technocratic warfare did not change from the First World War. The same principles applied in 1939 through 1945 as from 1914 to 1918. The only difference had to do with the speed, quantity, and complexity of what was technocratic. Total war required the quantification and control of military forces as operational, strategic, political, and economic phenomena. Fundamentally, the concerns of technocratic warfare are constant in time and place. By definition, they involve the development of the effective means and organization to project military force.

Modern warfare, by virtue of its scope and power, requires complex systems of management for military production and deployment and political support of military forces. The political aspects of war are related to the management of the mass media, the

³⁷¹Harrison, *Accounting for War*, 128–54; Harrison, *The Economics of World War II*, 1–42, 81–121; Nelson, *Arsenal of Democracy*, 212–68.

effective mobilization of elite and mass public opinion, and the whole range of public and high-level strategic diplomacy related to the operational aspects of the conflict. Technocratic epistemologies related to modern war bear upon the organizational and technological systems required by the state to sustain war.³⁷² While the importance of the political and tactical aspects of war is equal to or greater than that of military technology per se, the nation-state script requires the mass mobilization of societal technological resources for military applications. Earlier modern wars had produced new types of warships, rifles, cannons, and siege guns. The First World War had produced tanks, combat planes, chemical weapons, submarines, and more deadly artillery. During the Second World War, a virtual revolution in weapons systems occurred, including long-range bombers, ballistic missiles, massive battle tanks, completely mechanized armored divisions, and, finally, the development of the ultimate weapon—quintessential to war as a twentieth-century scientific phenomenon—the atomic bomb.³⁷³

The technocratic epistemologies for the Second World War were designed to achieve military advantage through any means possible. In a global war with no constraints, the objective of all combatants was to win, but to do so with the least harm possible to their nations. Scientific and technical knowledge from all fields became strategic assets in the development of military technologies. The range of epistemologies connected to this development process was indeed very comprehensive. The list included technological developments in air, sea, and land weapons, as well as military intelligence, ballistic science, the aforementioned nuclear physics of fission weapons, and the whole range of social science and legal knowledge connected to the management of the war economy. Also included on this list were the other epistemological systems underlying the propaganda campaigns and the long-range strategic planning for the postwar world, including legal, economic, and military systems. The war mobilized systems of technocratic knowledge from the physical and natural sciences to the “soft” areas of policy development and international law. Both military and civilian sectors of the economy developed technology to produce weapons systems, deploy them, and assess their effectiveness. Each of the combatant nations had technocratic scripts that affected knowledge systems for mobilization, mechanization, assessment, and control.

In every respect, each of the national scripts for the major combatants was informed by significant characteristics of technocratic organization and ideology. All of the Axis powers and the Allies understood that the war was a competition between not only cultures but also the military, scientific, and industrial means that could be brought to bear upon the political dimensions of the conflict. The Nazi assault on British sea

³⁷²Elizabeth Kier, *Imagining War: French and British Military Doctrine between the Wars* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997); Barry Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany between the World Wars* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984); Stoler, *Allies and Adversaries*, 23–102.

³⁷³Moy, *War Machines*, 68–97; Kenneth Macksey, *Technology in War: The Impact of Science on Weapon Development and Modern Battle* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1986), 109–74; William B. Breuer, *The Secret Weapons of WWII* (New York: Wiley, 2000).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

commerce, essential to the survival of Britain, was a military and scientific problem. The German submarine navy, under Admiral Donitz, was given the military and technical problem of destroying Britain's merchant marine fleet. For the British, the same context applied: how to develop intelligence, air, and naval antisubmarine capabilities to survive the assault. Over several years of sea warfare, the battle for sea supremacy went back and forth. After losing millions of tons of cargo vessels, the Allies succeeded in suppressing the German submarine offensive in the North Atlantic. Through industrial and scientific mobilization, American and British Empire forces developed the weapons systems, namely, encryption intelligence, microwave radar, sonar, long-range bombers, destroyers, and carrier escorts, to counter the fast and coordinated attacks by long-range, deep-diving German submarines.³⁷⁴

As noted, the technological and industrial competition of the war mobilized almost all the resources of the combatants. American industry was organized by the national government, whose wartime agencies, under the War Resources Board and the Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD), effectively developed the vast military technologies that the country deployed. All of the major combatant powers involved themselves in intense breakneck programs for the development of superweapons to use against their enemies. Both the Allies and the Axis nations pursued nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons programs. The operational use of such weapons of mass destruction was limited to the U.S. deployment of the atomic bomb against Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. The Germans and Japanese did not use their chemical and biological weapons for fear of retaliation (the Japanese did use biological weapons on Chinese civilians, but these were for "testing" purposes). The technological developments during the Second World War were enormous. The combined innovations by both sides would provide the foundations for the postindustrial technologies of solid-state digital computers, jet aircraft, space satellites and ballistic missile systems, nuclear medicine, and machine intelligence.³⁷⁵

³⁷⁴David Syrett, *The Defeat of the German U-boats: The Battle of the Atlantic* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994); David Alvarez, *Secret Messages: Codebreaking and American Diplomacy, 1930–1945* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000); David Syrett, ed., *The Battle of the Atlantic and Signals Intelligence: U-boat Situations and Trends, 1941–1945* (Brookfield, VT: Aldershot, 1998); Leo Marks, *Between Silk and Cyanide: A Codemaker's War, 1941–1945* (New York: Free Press, 1998); Hugh Sebag-Montefiore, *The Enigma: The Battle for the Code* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2000); David E. Fisher, *A Race on the Edge of Time: Radar—the Decisive Weapon of World War II* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1988); Louis Brown, *Technical and Military Imperatives: A Radar History of World War II* (Philadelphia: Institute of Physics, 1999).

³⁷⁵OSRD, *Advances in Military Medicine, Made by American Investigators*, 2 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1948); Vannevar Bush, *Science: The Endless Frontier* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1945); Guy Hartcup, *The Effect of Science on the Second World War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000); Scott McCartney, *ENIAC: The Triumphs and Tragedies of the World's First Computer* (New York: Walker, 1999).

The Manhattan Project

The quintessential technocratic project of the Second World War was the complex achievement of a nuclear fission device by the top-secret Manhattan Project. In the immediate postwar period, the atomic bomb would transform the world like no other invention. In real terms, the nuclear weapon created the Cold War. Its existence required the construction of the postwar national security system and all the attendant institutional and epistemological changes. The project involved the complex coordination of military and civilian institutions to use the scientific knowledge gained by a generation of eminent European physicists. The program was inspired by the well-founded fear of these physicists, then living principally in the United States and Great Britain, that recent breakthroughs in atomic-level physics had provided the Germans with the theoretical knowledge to develop an atomic superweapon. Such a device, it was surmised correctly, would release fantastic amounts of energy—enough power to destroy cities and turn the war radically against those who did not have it. Prior to the start of the war in Europe, a small group of refugee physicists familiar with recent innovative research on radioactivity and nuclear fission impressed their views on the United States government, resulting in the start of a nuclear research program. The prestige and influence of Albert Einstein, who wrote to the president in August 1939, was enough to convince Franklin Roosevelt that the United States needed to build its own weapon before Hitler had a chance to build his.³⁷⁶

The program was the largest and most costly scientific research project in history. Under the supervision of the OSRD and the Department of the Army, the Manhattan Project involved thousands of physicists, chemists, engineers, and technicians working feverishly over a period of five years. Production facilities operated by government, corporate, and academic laboratories created the many state-of-the-art industrial processes that were prerequisite to the final product. New physics, chemistry, and engineering knowledge was generated through the enormous expenditure of capital and human resources. The achievement of the nuclear weapon was only possible due to the deep reservoir of technical and organizational talents brought together by the national war emergency. Nearly the entire physics profession in the United States was dedicated to the Manhattan Project. The capital expenditure required, more than one billion dollars, a fantastic sum for the 1940s, was possible only because of the historical context of the Second World War. In sum, the institutional and epistemological developments associated with the project were as important to world history as the creation of the superweapon itself. From the wartime weapons development system came not only the atomic weapon but also the whole structure of a scientific-industrial state dedicated to the expansion of American military power through technological innovation. As a corollary to this, the entire expansion of American science and engineering in the postwar period

³⁷⁶William Lanouette, *Genius in the Shadows: A Biography of Leo Szilard, the Man behind the Bomb* (New York: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1992), 198–210.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

into microelectronics, space exploration, and information processing was germinated by the national and Anglo-American collaboration in developing the “A-bomb.”³⁷⁷

The war was already won, at least operationally, by the time the first nuclear device was tested in July 1945, at the White Sands testing range in the New Mexican desert. Nazi Germany lay in ruins, as did most of the cities of imperial Japan, when the Enola Gay flew over Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. When the mushroom cloud engulfed the city, sending huge balls of flames and dust into the atmosphere, a new age in human history was born. No longer was war simply a confrontation between belligerent armies on a defined battlefield. Now, the nuclear weapon threatened the entire concept of war as well as civilization. Ironically, this was not immediately apparent to many observers. Yet, the legacy of the first bomb echoed deeply through postwar world history. The A-bomb was a weapon beyond the pale in its destructiveness. Built on the revolution in physical science that began with relativity, quantum mechanics, and the discoveries of radiation and nuclear fission, the weapon was the intellectual product of thousands of scientists and engineers. It gave the United States, and ultimately the rest of humankind, a device that superseded the explosive power of all existing weapons systems. In doing so, it was an invention that made the annihilation of mankind a distinct possibility.³⁷⁸

In the Manhattan Project, the technocratic epistemologies for both war and peace expanded dramatically. In the space of five years, the mere theoretical possibility of a superweapon came to be reality. As many hundreds of thousands of survivors from Hiroshima and Nagasaki coped with the horrible reality of what had happened to them and their communities, a whole new science of nuclear weapons was born. In the first fifteen years of the postwar period, thousands of nuclear devices were added to each of the superpowers’ nuclear arsenals. Nuclear theory became the nuclear bomb, with all the vast imperatives this gave to its implementing scientific, military, and industrial institutions. For the United States, the nuclear age would provide an organizing principle for the militarized technocratic state. The national security state, which had come into its own during the war, became a permanent institutional system. Nuclear weapons required their own strategic doctrines, engineering designs, and theoretical visions for their further evolution and development. In this way, the Manhattan Project became one of the most important legacies of the Second World War. The A-bomb, built to order by hundreds of cooperating institutions, fulfilled the scientific, industrial, and military scripts for global warfare in the technocratic age. Paradoxically, nuclear weapons created a stable postwar

³⁷⁷K. D. Nichols, *The Road to Trinity* (New York: Morrow, 1987); Richard Rhodes, *The Making of the Atomic Bomb* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1986); Ferenc Morton Szasz, *British Scientists and the Manhattan Project: The Los Alamos Years* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1992); Gunnar Skogmar, *Nuclear Triangle: Relations between the United States, Great Britain and France in the Atomic Energy Field, 1939–1950* (Copenhagen: Copenhagen Political Studies Press, 1993).

³⁷⁸Martin Sherwin, *A World Destroyed: The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance* (New York: Knopf, 1975); Lanouette, *Genius in the Shadows*, 447–64; Helen S. Hawkins, G. Allen Greb, and Gertrud Weiss Szilard, eds., *Toward a Livable World: Leo Szilard and the Crusade for Nuclear Arms Control* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987).

international system, albeit one dominated by nuclear terror. Once more, the redeemer nation came upon a solution that it was unprepared for. Compelled by war to build the weapon, it was condemned to deal with the consequences for the rest of the century and beyond.

Postwar Planning

Remarkably, in the midst of total war, with the full-blown firebombing of metropolitan areas, mass executions, death camps, and all manner of atrocities committed on all sides, the liberal vision of a postwar world thrived. It did so in the environs of the U.S. State Department, the British Foreign Office, and elsewhere in the free world. Even the Soviet Union, under the tyranny of Stalin, was an active participant in the rebirth of Wilsonian idealism. The neo-Wilsonian world, as envisioned by international lawyers, statesmen, and social scientists, was one founded on the same principles as the failed League of Nations. A new supranational organization would actively participate in the long-range planning of global development. Democratic institutions and the culture of liberal internationalism would be promoted in the interests of world peace, along with the accepted rights of all nations and individuals to enjoy security, liberty, and economic progress. As horrific battles raged in places such as Stalingrad, Leningrad, Guadalcanal, Borneo, China, Normandy, the Balkans, Poland, Hungary, and finally Germany and Japan themselves, an idealized concept of world order was incorporated into the charter of the United Nations.³⁷⁹

The reasons for this paradoxical situation were rather simple. There was a broad consensus among political leaderships that the Second World War should not and could not be repeated. Once more, the human race had to gather the political will to establish an international system that would end major war, not only through the traditional balance of power, but through the development of those conditions that would prevent the basis of major armed conflicts from occurring again. Once more, the Kantian vision of a perpetual peace, based upon free commerce and the universal acceptance of peace as a norm in world society, would be the paradigm for the postwar settlement. In this way, the planning for the United Nations was quite similar to the military projects sponsored by the great powers, notably the Manhattan Project. The similarity was not in intention but in organization and process. Both war and peace, in the technocratic context of the Second World War, required the detailed work of technocrats. As discussed, military technocrats, armed with epistemologies of war, namely, weapons systems and strategic plans, were involved in one aspect of the war settlement. At the same time, civilian analysts and lawyers, trained in various aspects of economic and political science, were involved in the drafting of the founding documents for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and other U.N. agencies. Planners were also hard at work at the State Department and elsewhere on the

³⁷⁹*Luard*, *A History of the United Nations*, 17–90; *Hoopes and Brinkley*, *FDR and the Creation of the U.N.*, 133–58; *Hilderbrand*, *Dumbarton Oaks*, 108–21.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

reconstruction of both the war-ravaged allied countries of Europe and Asia, and the defeated enemy powers.³⁸⁰

The script for a revised world order, envisioned by both Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, was of an international society that realized the aspirations of all colonial and noncolonial peoples for political freedom and economic development. The externalization of the New Deal, as Warren Kimball noted in his study of Roosevelt's decision-making, was the quintessential concept behind Roosevelt's plan for the end of the war.³⁸¹ It would fulfill the goals and the idealized concept of American life that had inspired him through his entire life. A world order dedicated to human rights, freedom, economic justice, and prosperity would be an international environment that would be morally acceptable and practically safe for American liberalism. The United Nations was conceived as Roosevelt's principal vehicle of the new American world order. It was perfectly consistent with the spirit and the script of the redeemer nation, in which the highest goals of Western humanism would be met by the institutional order of a new liberal world body. As the vast apparatus of the national security state orchestrated the work of an entire society, including fourteen million in the armed forces, the State Department's lawyers drafted preliminary documents for the United Nations. The overwhelming preponderance of American power in a postwar world made its national vision the blueprint for and the definition of the new body of international politics and law. The political economy of the postwar world, the framework for collective security, and the practical organization of power outside of the Soviet Union would be a task for the redeemer nation. The United Nations, formed in the fire of the second global war of the century, would emerge as Roosevelt's postwar legacy. Undoubtedly, he would have wished it more luck in organizing a just international system. Instead, the exigencies of the war settlement would fall upon the American national security state as it built a worldview consonant with the script of the redeemer nation, but also very different from Roosevelt's plan.³⁸²

The Technocratic War Ends

The end of the war meant the cessation of wholesale destruction on both sides. The Allies had returned the Axis treatment of Allied civilian populations in kind. Hundreds of thousands of German and Japanese civilians lost their lives in the firebombing of cities carried out by American forces. The atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed

³⁸⁰Brett D. Schaefer, *The Bretton Woods Institutions: History and Reform Proposals* (Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation, 2000); Robert W. Oliver, *George Woods and the World Bank* (Boulder, CO: Rienner, 1995); Jochen Kraske, *Bankers with a Mission: The Presidents of the World Bank, 1946–91* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 7–73; Catherine Gwin, "U.S. Relations with the World Bank, 1945–1992," in Devesh Kapur, ed., *The World Bank: Its First Half Century*, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1997), 2:195–274, and Devesh Kapur, "The Bank for Reconstruction, 1944–48," in *ibid.*, 1:57–84.

³⁸¹Kimball, *The Juggler*, 187–88.

³⁸²Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 254–63; Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*, 1–22.

more civilians than any bombing attack in history, save the possible exception of the March 1945 firebombing of Tokyo. The Axis regimes were destroyed in their totality. Hitler committed suicide in his bunker rather than face capture and trial. In the end, his script had run its course perfectly. He had triumphed in conquering lebensraum and effecting the near annihilation of the Jews and other inferior races. Then, in the face of the destruction of the German army and the Third Reich, he had destroyed himself. A martyr to his own evil creation, National Socialism, he ordered his body and that of his mistress, Eva Braun, and her five children immolated before their capture by the Russians. In doing so, Hitler ensured that his status as a martyr to Nazism and his crude genocidal theory of a master race would survive in the idolatry of extreme right-wing nationalists and white supremacists for generations to come.³⁸³

Japanese and Italian fascists met similar fates. Mussolini's script ended with his death and public dismemberment. His dreams of a new Roman Empire revealed the deluded nature of his leadership. The Italians, who were never very good at modern warfare, lost the war in miserable fashion. Only the force of the Third Reich kept the Italian fascists in the war until the end. On the other side of the world, the Japanese military junta had thought of letting the Japanese nation die in the defense of the empire, as American bombers, carriers, and nuclear weapons converged on the homeland. Yet, the revenge of the redeemer nation was so severe, so massive and merciless, that the Japanese emperor intervened to force his country's surrender. Right-wing military officers committed ritual suicide after peace terms were announced. The survival of the Japanese and, most importantly, the survival of the imperial system overrode the intentions of the militarists to have the nation die as samurai warriors.³⁸⁴

The essential element in the defeat of the Nazis was the script of the Grand Alliance. National institutions mobilized under the crisis of international war and worked cooperatively across international boundaries to defeat an enemy of enormous power and ruthlessness. The effective coordination of the three powers was a precondition for the defeat of Hitler and the Japanese. It was up to Hitler to create the alliance (with his attack on the Soviets) and it was up to the Grand Alliance leadership (Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin) to maintain the critical cooperation to defeat the Nazi and Japanese war machines. With the end of the war, the reconstruction of the postwar world became the new focus of the Western script.

The cultural dimension of the war's impact was profound. National cultures, whose very existence came into question, recalled the war in epic terms. It was a war that both

³⁸³Anton Joachimsthaler, *The Last Days of Hitler: The Legends, the Evidence, the Truth* (London: Arms and Armour Press, 1996); Peter Wyden, *The Hitler Virus: The Insidious Legacy of Adolf Hitler* (New York: Arcade, 2001), 183–264.

³⁸⁴Ruth Ben-Ghiat, *Fascist Modernities: Italy, 1922–1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Yumiko Iida, *Rethinking Identity in Modern Japan: Nationalism as Aesthetics* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Kosaku Yoshino, *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan: A Sociological Enquiry* (New York: Routledge, 1992); John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of WWII* (New York: Norton, 1999).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

destroyed and liberated humankind in the technocratic age of science and industrialism. Like the Great War, it reconstituted political, economic, and cultural systems. Technological revolution, found in the birth of electromechanical computers, cybernetics, transistors, nuclear fission, microwave communications, and aerospace and rocketry, would make the war the progenitor not only of the Cold War, but of the post-Cold War information culture of the twenty-first century. Yet, the legacy of the war in social terms was most often devastating, even if with that destruction there was also triumph. It would be the task of entire generations of national cultures to define and explain the war within their own cultural context.³⁸⁵ Collective and personal scars from the war's atrocities and deprivations served as a historical backdrop to the next period in world history. The survivors of the worst forms of destruction, the Nazi death camps and the atomic bombings, would recount the destruction brought by the war and the scientific and industrial institutions that were fundamental to it. Both the Holocaust and the Trinity bomb were artifacts of the technocratic age. The Nazi extermination plan combined the cruelty of a warrior culture deeply rooted in ancient European history and the organizational practices of an industrialized scientific culture existing squarely in the present. In the case of the atomic bomb, the scientific establishment developed the weapon, and the U.S. Army, a war-defined technocratic machine, delivered it.³⁸⁶

In the postwar world, a new international society, immersed in technocratic architecture, science, and political economy, emerged in cosmopolitan areas on every continent. A new electronic culture was built in the decades after the war, magnifying the effects of globalism that the war initiated. Post-World War II international society was filled with new inventions. There were satellite communications, television and radio stations, stereophonic music, and a media culture built more on pictures than on words. All of these technical and social innovations were mainly or partly a result of a determined process of war-related development. The drive to develop war technologies resulted in the huge innovations in aerospace, ballistics, and microwave communications. The war seeded the information technology revolution through the invention of transistors, cybernetics, and the electronic computer. For better or worse, the nuclear age, as noted, was born out of the war; otherwise, no civilian project of such magnitude would have been financed. The physical systems for the projection of military power around the

³⁸⁵Yoshikuni Igarashi, *Bodies of Memory: Narratives of War in Postwar Japanese Culture, 1945–1970* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Malcolm Smith, *Britain and 1940: History, Myth, and Popular Memory* (New York: Routledge, 2000); Adam Nossiter, *The Algeria Hotel: France, Memory, and the Second World War* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001); Donald Bloxham, *Genocide on Trial: War Crimes Trials and the Formation of Holocaust History and Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

³⁸⁶Alperovitz, *The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb*, 645–48; Michael J. Hogan, ed., *Hiroshima in History and Memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Kai Bird and Lawrence Lifschultz, *Hiroshima's Shadow: Writings on the Denial of History and the Smithsonian Controversy* (Stony Creek, CT: Pamphleteer's Press, 1998); James J. Orr, *The Victim as Hero: Ideology of Peace and National Identity in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001).

world resulted in a postwar world of expansive superpowers dominating a bipolar world order. Before the war, nuclear weapons, rockets, and electronic information systems were all science fiction. By its end, the technocratic planning systems of the great powers had to account for a new international system in which the speed and range of weapons systems were clearly becoming global.³⁸⁷

The war's political legacy was its reconstitution of the international system. The European empires that had survived the First World War were weakened fatally by the Second. Within twenty years, virtually all of the Western European colonies were granted independence. Where once vast regions of Asia and Africa were under the suzerainty of relatively small European nations, by the middle period of the Cold War the international system boasted nearly two hundred members, many of whom had barely entered the modern age in any meaningful sense. The United States, the ultimate victor of both the First and Second World Wars, was compelled to protect the integrity of the liberal technocratic order. To maintain global order and to fulfill its aspirations and its self-defined mission as a redemptive agent, the country financed the unprecedented military budgets of the postwar era.³⁸⁸

In political, economic, and military terms, the territorial space occupied by the postwar American nation-state expanded to global proportions. It was not the immediate intention of American planners that the postwar settlement would include a global national security state. Yet, the circumstances affecting the European and East Asian war settlement suggested the possibility of a communist-dominated Asia and Europe. The prospect would result in the institutionalization of an ongoing postwar conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States. That process established the Cold War's global characteristics; anticommunist elites, ensured of American support, dominated authoritarian regimes from Iran to the Philippines to Guatemala to the Congo. Yet, the institutional framework for the global state was founded during the Second World War. That institutional system of closely related organizations, sharing a collective memory of appeasement and global war, would live on through the century, becoming the nexus of ideological, epistemological, and organizational development during the Cold War.³⁸⁹ It would take the global war to another stage in the metascript—a stage in which the two sides existed in a state of suspicion and hostility, while the technocratic structures of

³⁸⁷Two of the classic works on nuclear war were written less than fifteen years after Hiroshima. By 1960, nuclear annihilation as a postwar reality was well established in the literature. See Bernard Brodie, *Strategy in the Missile Age* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959) and Herman Kahn, *On Thermonuclear War*.

³⁸⁸Miroslav Nincic, *The Arms Race: The Political Economy of Military Growth* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1982), 10–64; William J. Weida and Frank L. Gertcher, *The Political Economy of National Defense* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987); Hooks, *Forging the Military-Industrial Complex*, 92–123.

³⁸⁹Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, 142–81; Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*, 220–29; Cumings, *Parallax Visions*, 74–104.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

power and knowledge continued to grow and expand, eventually to outstrip the very system that engendered their existence.

Chapter V

The Orthodox Cold War

The Cold War's Metascript

Returning to the vantage point of the world atlas photographs taken some twenty thousand miles from earth, we see that the end of the Second World War and the period in history known as the Cold War had virtually no effect. Watching intently from geosynchronous orbit, an observer would not have noticed much of the war that wreaked havoc in Europe and East Asia. To the naked eye, the battle of Stalingrad would not have been visible. The tens of millions of casualties on the Russian plains, the huge tank battles and artillery barrages that decided the war in Europe would not have been noticed except for perhaps the flashes of large explosions, mere dots sparkling into outer space. The observer would have had no idea of the massive planning operations for the Normandy invasion or whether the invasion had taken place, or any of the political intrigue that accompanied the war. The only war-related events of measurable importance to the observer would have been the nuclear explosion in the New Mexican desert in July 1945 that began the atomic age, and the subsequent blasts at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Over the course of the next several decades, the observer might have seen other nuclear open-air blasts in the twenty years or so that those were allowed for testing. However, nothing else would have been apparent to the naked eye, from the beginning of the Cold War to its end some forty-five years later. In terms of geology, the observer might have seen changes in the amount of vegetation on various points of the planet. He or she might notice, comparing photographs from the 1940s with those from the 1980s and 1990s, that the amount of green color had declined, representing the effects of population growth, desertification, and the clearing of forest lands by humans. However, from a geophysical perspective, the earth would have hardly changed. Perhaps, because of the rise in the earth's temperature due to greenhouse gases, the polar ice capes would have receded measurably, but otherwise the earth would not have changed at all. This might be our

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

conclusion in spite of what we know. In the space of no more than two human generations, human civilization had undergone very rapid change that could be defined as beneficial, or in other ways destructive to humans and to their surroundings. The world had changed through a global human culture that was responsive to the growth of institutions, complex intellectual technologies, and a collective script for humanity that distributed success as well as tragedy across the surface of the earth.

The Cold War was a metascript that carried the world through parallel revolutions in political economy, institutions, social and scientific thought, and technology. In its aftermath, a still conflicted and much impoverished world had become enveloped by a new technocratic order. A huge technological complex connected billions of human beings in the emergence of a new civilization. A new global script was founded upon the technologies that governed the nuclear and conventional military confrontation between the two superpowers. However, at its beginning, nothing was very clear except the horrific legacy of the last war and the cruel possibilities for a new one. In its broadest context, the conflict, as with its immediate predecessor, was an international confrontation that involved the international community in its entirety. The conflict, global and ideological, lasted for more than four decades. The United States alone, it was estimated, spent more than ten trillion dollars related to the global confrontation between Marxist-Leninist and liberal ideology, and between the interests of the United States and the Soviet Union as competing nation-states. It may not be entirely accurate for world history to privilege one or several perspectives of the major actors in the conflict when there were so many others. However, since this book concerns the history of the twentieth century in the Western and most particularly the American context, it is that perspective that I will discuss primarily in this and ensuing chapters.³⁹⁰

³⁹⁰In addition to the works previously cited by Hogan, Cumings, Gaddis, and Leffler, recent important literature includes Melvyn P. Leffler and David S. Painter, eds., *Origins of the Cold War: An International History* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Odd Arne Westad, ed., *Reviewing the Cold War: Approaches, Interpretations, and Theory*, *Nobel Symposium* (London: Frank Cass, 2000); Lori Lyn Bogle, ed., *The Cold War*, 5 vols. (New York: Routledge, 2001); Adam B. Ulam, *Understanding the Cold War: A Historian's Personal Reflections* (Charlottesville, VA: Leopold Press, 2000); Abbott Gleason, *Totalitarianism: The Inner History of the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Gregory Mitrovich, *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc, 1947–1956* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000); Matthew Evangelista, *Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999); Paul A. Chilton, *Security Metaphors: Cold War Discourse from Containment to Common House* (New York: P. Lang, 1996); Godfried van Benthem van den Bergh, *The Nuclear Revolution and the End of the Cold War: Forced Restraint* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1992); Robert C. Grogan, *Natural Enemies: The United States and the Soviet Union in the Cold War, 1917–1991* (Boulder, CO: Lexington Books, 2001); Peter W. Rodman, *More Precious Than Peace: The Cold War and the Struggle for the Third World* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994); Chen Jian, *Mao's China and the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Richard Ned Lebow and Thomas Risse-Kappen, eds., *International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995);

I do so even though the Soviet Union's history of the Cold War was every bit as representative of what happened in the world between 1945 and 1990 as the American narrative. Even if we, as free people in the post-Cold War era, reject the principles of the Soviet state and those of most other communist or nondemocratic states, the perspective of hard-line Soviets was indeed a "genuine" view of the Cold War. In the Soviet context, the Cold War pitted international revolutionary movements against world capitalism. Socialist movements fought a battle over decades to preserve the international movement founded upon the ideas of Marx and Lenin. In the end, however, the capitalists were far stronger than the socialists, defeating them through more productive economic methods. Although socialism was at a severe disadvantage vis-à-vis an adversary that dominated the world economically, the movement survived as a rival of capitalism for more than seventy years, and continues to survive as a voice for the dispossessed in Third World countries. However, in the dominant Western context, the socialist view of history was misguided and most certainly a fraudulent perspective from which to view recent world history. The socialist view of the Cold War denies what the world has learned about the history of communism during the post-Cold War period—namely, that the dissidents of the Soviet era were right. The nature of Soviet-bloc communism was defined by appalling brutality. As discussed earlier, the practices of the bloc were based upon a political ideology that subscribed to totalitarian methods that resulted in the deaths of millions.³⁹¹

The Western Cold War narrative starts from the Second World War and continues to the beginning of the information age. It works through the global transformations in the context of the East-West conflict, also known as the struggle of the free world against totalitarianism. As events unfolded, the script wove together accepted central concepts of human freedom with their societal referents. These were equality, civil rights, democratic development, and the strategic concepts related to military power and national security.

Pierre Allan and Kjell Goldmann, eds., The End of the Cold War: Evaluating Theories of International Relations (Boston: Kluwer Law International, 1995); Raymond L. Garthoff, A Journey through the Cold War: A Memoir of Containment and Coexistence (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2001); Vladislav Zubok and Constantine Pleshakov, Inside the Kremlin's Cold War: From Stalin to Khrushchev (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996); Richard J. Aldrich, The Hidden Hand: Britain, America and Cold War Secret Intelligence (London: John Murray, 2001); Scott Lucas, Freedom's War: The American Crusade against the Soviet Union (New York: New York University, 1999); Norman Friedman, The Fifty-Year War: Conflict and Strategy in the Cold War (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2000); Martin J. Medhurst, Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1997); Benjamin O. Fordham, Building the Cold War Consensus: The Political Economy of U.S. National Security Policy, 1949–51 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998); Walter LaFeber, America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945–2000 (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2002).

³⁹¹*Stephane Courtois et al., The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Conquest, The Great Terror; Davies, Europe, 1089–1109, 1329; Andrzej Walicki, Marxism and the Leap to the Kingdom of Freedom: The Rise and Fall of the Communist Utopia (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995).*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

For the West (excluding Western communists who most often sided loyally with the international movement) the challenge posed after the destruction of fascism was clear. Witnesses to the Stalinist atrocities in the Soviet Union had no doubts about the nature of the enemy. Within just a few years after the Second World War the new script had transformed itself into a confirmed orthodoxy. From the late 1940s to the 1960s, the tone of the Cold War was hard and militarized, with little room for compromise shown by either side. This is what I term the orthodox period of the conflict. The elucidation of many of its aspects is the concern of this chapter.

Orthodoxy eventually transitioned to revisionism or postorthodoxy during the 1960s. The American revisionist script carried the narrative through the end of the Vietnam War and the one tumultuous term of the Carter administration. American Cold War revisionism challenged fundamental aspects of the technocratic state and its ideology. When the revisionist period was finally overtaken by the neo-orthodoxy of the Reagan era, a new conservative script reinforced the old liberationist ideology of the Cold War. Finally, when the Soviets had reached the end of their system, the Cold War ended, not in cataclysm but in a series of events that dismantled the edifice, physically, emotionally, and intellectually.³⁹²

With each movement, the Cold War script reoriented, bringing the actors into dialectical exchanges that concerned power, economics, and the political dynamics of twentieth-century history. After the Cuban Missile Crisis, the nuclear test ban treaty, the Gulf of Tonkin, and finally the commitment of American combat units in large numbers in Vietnam, the ensuing antiwar movement brought the Cold War into the period of postorthodoxy or revisionism. In the revisionist era, the ideology of the script was successfully challenged in the public crises over Vietnam. The revisionist Cold War led to an intellectual as well as a political and social revolution in America. In American intellectual discourse, the left blossomed. Feminism, environmentalism, and ethnic liberation movements marked a new and aggressive age of reform that sought to capture the energy and radicalism of earlier populist and progressive-era movements. As nuclear weapons grew more deadly, and as hundreds of thousands of American troops were deployed in the swamps and mountain highlands of Indochina, the Cold War became an object of political debate.³⁹³

The revisionist period replaced the Soviet Union with China as the main enemy, and then, with Nixon's opening to China and the ensuing events of the 1970s, the Chinese became allies and the Soviet threat was reborn. Finally, in the post-Vietnam period, the

³⁹²Bernard Wheaton and Zdenek Kavan, *The Velvet Revolution: Czechoslovakia, 1988–1991* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995); *American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Exit from Communism* (Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1992); Maier, *Dissolution*.

³⁹³Noam Chomsky, *American Power and the New Mandarins* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969) and *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies* (Boston: South End Press, 1989); Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1993); Isserman and Kazin, *America Divided*.

revived Soviet threat returned the Cold War to a period of neo-orthodoxy. Now, the Soviets were once more formidable and aggressive. The Soviets appeared to threaten a first strike capability in the early 1980s, and, indeed, a nuclear war was narrowly avoided in 1983. In the face of this genuine threat, the neo-orthodox script entertained one of the principal ideas of the late Cold War—the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The Reagan administration promised the ultimate deployment of the technocratic age, a massive trillion-dollar futuristic edifice, demonstrating the status of the military in Reagan’s America and the regard for the technocratic scientific-industrial system for the production of superweapons and control systems of infinite complexity.³⁹⁴

Finally, the international rivalry ended—the Soviets and their empire collapsed. The Chinese and a handful of other states survived as Marxist-Leninist states, but the Cold War as an international phenomenon of historical importance had indeed become history. With its end came a new turn in the literature of the conflict. The post-Cold War period brought new evidence and new perspectives; multinational and multiarchival research was undertaken in hopes of finally bringing perspective to an extraordinary period in world history. The literature on the Cold War, as with the First and Second World Wars, has become an entity unto itself. Given the length of the conflict and the intensive ongoing scholarship being done in archives all over the world, its subject depth is truly great. The research includes work to elucidate the decision-making that guided the communist regimes. This includes research on the Soviet Union, the People’s Republic of China, the Eastern European allies or satellites, Vietnam, North Korea, and other national governments and political parties allied against the West. The quality and quantity of the evidence, archival or otherwise, varies from one country to the next. Archival materials on diplomatic history have become available to different degrees from various foreign countries. The evidence from all sources, Western and non-Western, communist and noncommunist, varies widely. However, the greatest amount of documentation, and where much more work and evidence should be revealed, remains in the United States. As any scholar of the period can attest, the U.S. archives offer the most extensive diplomatic, military, and institutional records, preserved at various sites around the country. One scholar could not master all archival sources from around the world that bear upon the Cold War. Nor could one individual read the full historiography of the period. These statements would be true even if the person were limited to reading the diplomatic history of the period, which spanned four and one-half decades of international history and involved scores of international actors.

³⁹⁴For a clear understanding of the expansion of Soviet power in the late 1970s, albeit in response to the continued technological development of Western strength, see the memoirs of Jimmy Carter’s national security adviser, Brzezinski, *Power and Principle*, 426–69; Reiss, *The Strategic Defense Initiative*; Frances Fitzgerald, *Way out There in the Blue: Reagan, Star Wars, and the End of the Cold War* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000); Sanford Lakoff, *A Shield in Space? Technology, Politics, and the Strategic Defense Initiative* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

As a result of the Cold War, the redeemer nation expanded its domain to a degree that earlier generations of Americans might have found unimaginable. To sustain the containment structure and its global mandate, the once isolationist nation achieved a truly hegemonic presence in the international system. American imperialism at the turn of the nineteenth century had envisioned an aggressive America that dominated the Pacific and Atlantic oceans and the Western Hemisphere. Yet, the technocratic nation-state that came out of the Second World War was an order of magnitude greater than the early twentieth-century Rooseveltian or Mahanian vision of a powerful America. The new American hegemony that arrived during the Truman administration and developed continuously over decades went far beyond the steel battleships and coaling stations of the classic period of American overseas expansion. Rather, in 1950, the containment structure for the national security state as it surveyed the world had come to include the planet in its entirety. As with all great powers in history, from ancient Rome to the Spanish, French, and British empires of the modern period, the United States would exercise its newly founded hegemony to project its technocratic script.³⁹⁵

The Soviet Union, the American nemesis, was involved in the same project. A superpower in its own right, although perhaps not a match for the scientific-industrial strength of the United States, the Soviet Union projected its script too. The Soviet script was a synthesis of Russian authoritarianism and the metascript for Marxist-Leninist ideology. Stalin had been the master of the union of Russia's absolutist history and its Leninist ideology. He had used the Soviet Communist Party as a weapon, destroying enemies and perceived enemies. His ruthlessness was indeed quite pathological. Nonetheless, in the last years of his rule, he followed a policy that confronted the United States as well as American European allies still carrying on their exploitation of colonial peoples. He challenged the United States, as did his successor, Nikita Khrushchev. The Soviet challenges in Korea, Berlin, and Cuba demonstrated the power of the Soviet Union and its global status as a superpower. The Soviet script built Russian power on the nuclear weapons it manufactured, and on the ballistic missiles it developed to demonstrate to the world that it was the equal of the United States. If the Soviets feared the United States, which they did, they still believed in the viability and justness of the socialist command economies they supported in Europe and elsewhere.³⁹⁶

³⁹⁵Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, 448–53; Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*, 209–64; Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 89–128; Cumings, *The Roaring of the Cataract*, 35–78; Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, 373–95.

³⁹⁶R. C. Raack, *Stalin's Drive to the West, 1938–1945: The Origins of the Cold War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995); Bullock, *Hitler and Stalin*, 916–57; John C. Ausland, *Kennedy, Khrushchev, and the Berlin-Cuba Crisis, 1961–1964* (Boston: Scandinavian University Press, 1996); James G. Richter, *Khrushchev's Double Bind: International Pressures and Domestic Coalition Politics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 58–173; Sergei N. Khrushchev, *Nikita Khrushchev and the Creation of a Superpower* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2000), 439–662.

On one level, the Cold War was a rivalry between nation-states. Warsaw Pact and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces, instruments of Soviet and American power, watched and tested each other over decades. In Korea, Chinese and Korean forces fought a proxy war against the Americans. In Vietnam, Vietnamese forces did the same thing. In Cuba in 1962, Soviet and American air and naval units tested the possibility of nuclear war. In Afghanistan in the 1980s, Afghan guerrillas tested the Soviet army in its destructive counterinsurgency campaign against the tribesmen. Proxy wars and crises typified the contest. China was used by the Soviets in Korea, but later the Chinese formed their own position during the 1960s to oppose both the United States and the Soviet Union. In Vietnam, Soviet and Chinese aid supported the North Vietnamese, but neither country moved toward war against the other. Finally, in the last two decades of the conflict, China moved toward a de facto alliance against the Soviets. Chinese and American forces, along with European, Middle Eastern, and Central American nations allied with the West, contained the Soviet Union in the 1980s.³⁹⁷

Like all other international wars, this one was a working out of national scripts. The interior conflicts that defined societies were represented in the external reality of international conflict. On a higher level, however, the scripts for the Soviet Union and America were connected. What was unique about the Cold War was its global and largely bipolar nature. Never before in world history had the entire surface of the globe been a contested space between two powers. Technological advances had made the reach of the opposing military systems unlimited. The missiles, satellites, nuclear submarines, and aircraft carriers of the superpowers roamed the earth in its totality. The Second World War had been global, as were the First World War, the Napoleonic Wars, and earlier still the eighteenth-century sea-power wars between Great Britain and France. In world history, no land empire was larger than the Mongolian of the Middle Ages, or more lasting than the Roman Empire. Yet, the Cold War involved the human race in its entirety over two generations. It linked thousands of cultures and innumerable national, group, and institutional scripts in a global narrative. The encounter between them, like the earlier scripts for the international system, coalesced around the global theater and the metascript for humankind.³⁹⁸

When the two powers divided Europe and the Korean peninsula, and set the lines for containment throughout Asia, Stalin's Russia was linked to the larger transnational script that governed Marxist-Leninist ideology. The script for Marxist-Leninist regimes, like the script for the Roman Catholic Church or the script for Sunni Islam, or the script for any doctrinal system, programmed the operational methods that established Stalinist or

³⁹⁷Li and Li, China and the United States; Jian, Mao's China and the Cold War, 205–76.

³⁹⁸Adas, *Islamic and European Expansion*; Michael W. Doyle, *Empires* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986), 51–138; S. N. Eisenstadt, *The Political Systems of Empires* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1993), 156–221; Timothy Parsons, *The British Imperial Century, 1815–1914: A World History Perspective* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999); Susan E. Alcock, ed., *Empires: Perspectives from Archaeology and History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, 357–72.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Marxist-Leninist regimes around the world. The ponderous Soviet state, overburdened with technocratic systems of control, attempted the ongoing project of scientific socialism, the national and multinational realization of the ideas of Marx and Lenin. Conversely, the American script linked itself to the liberal culture, whose origins, like those of Marx and Lenin, were in early modern European history. American liberal ideology and technocratic liberal designs realized the liberal metascript—in practice a more dynamic and effective political economy than its socialist rival. As historians and political scientists examined the connections between ideology and nationalism, their subjects did precisely what they expected. The nationalist scripts were connected but subsumed under the transnational scripts for Marxism-Leninism and twentieth-century Western liberalism.³⁹⁹

In the abstract, the question for the Cold War was simple enough to understand, no matter where the observer was on the ideological spectrum. Plainly, which of these transnational scripts would finally triumph? Which metascript divined from European history would capture cultural and political dominance of the international system? Which view of the state and the nature of political economy would determine the path of world history? These were the stakes as understood by dedicated communists in Moscow and elsewhere in the world, and by the Truman administration in the spring of 1950 when national security thinkers, businessmen, social scientists, diplomats, and public administrators created the framework for Cold War containment. To some of the victims of communism who had survived imprisonment and/or exile, the answer was also simple enough. “Being precedes essence,” proclaimed Václav Havel to the world, words that related the idea of a failed materialism. To those trapped in the socialist world, tractors and cement factories and mass education could not replace freedom and autonomy. The simple right of individual freedom, lost under socialism, was irreplaceable to people who saw freedom just across the divide of Europe. The other script, democratic liberalism, provided freedom, and, as we know, much more.⁴⁰⁰

Clearly, the socialist technocratic project failed because its doctrines denied the essence of modern Western modernity, which is the idea that individuals have a primary claim upon society and the state. Despite the high hopes of Western intellectuals who subscribed to dialectical materialism as a theory of history and a political movement for the liberation of humankind, in the end it was the Marxist variant of socialism that strangled itself. Yet at mid-century, the reasons for communist liberation were apparent to those activists and thinkers who saw the most abhorrent aspects of fascism in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. It was completely evident to leftist observers, right up to the fall of the Berlin Wall and even afterward, that socialism was necessary. They saw the cruel exploitation of human beings working in fields as farm laborers on large estates or in

³⁹⁹Vladimir Shalpentokh, *A Normal Totalitarian Society: How the Soviet Union Functioned and How It Collapsed* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2001), 3–62; Gregor, *Faces of Janus*, 45–88; Chris Ward, ed., *The Stalinist Dictatorship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 148–227.

⁴⁰⁰Tim Whipple, *After the Revolution: The New Leaders of Czechoslovakia Speak Out* (New York: Freedom House, 1991); Wheaton and Kavan, *The Velvet Revolution*, 127–51.

factories producing cheap exports for apparel companies in the West. They saw the plight of Amazonian Indians, as well as the indigenous peoples in the Andes, Central America, Mexico, sub-Saharan Africa, and everywhere on the planet where raw materials, unskilled labor, and global capitalism mixed together. The need for revolution was seen by the left not only in the socialist bloc, but also by every manner of Marxist, neo-Marxist, and social democrat who witnessed and experienced the real practice of capitalism on every continent in the world.⁴⁰¹

The revolutions that overthrew right-wing authoritarian regimes in China in the late 1940s; in Indochina in the 1950s, 1960s, and finally 1970s; in Korea in the late 1940s; and in Cuba in the late 1950s were all popular revolutions. Throughout the Cold War, radical movements everywhere gained followers opposed to the mercenary regimes of so many Third World countries. Before communism died in Europe in the late 1980s, communist or socialist-oriented regimes spread throughout Africa and Asia and found wide public support in many areas of Latin America. The material deprivations that Third World and, in some cases, First World capitalism inflicted upon workers and farmers united them in the belief in a socialist path to development. When that development failed, as it did all over the world, the revolutionary script began to lose legitimacy. The cultural diffusion of Western values and tastes lured the Third World away from gray authoritarian socialism. In Latin America, Africa, and Asia, animosity felt toward the United States as an imperialist nation no longer was as prevalent and pervasive.⁴⁰² By the late 1980s, with socialism around the world moving toward the West for financial and

⁴⁰¹ John Lee Anderson, *Che Guevara: A Revolutionary Life* (New York: Grove Press, 1997); Marifeli Perez-Stable, *The Cuban Revolution: Origins, Course, and Legacy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 36–120; Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy*; Cedric J. Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Forrest D. Colburn, *The Vogue of Revolution in Poor Countries* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994); Barry M. Schutz and Robert O. Slater, eds., *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World* (Boulder, CO: Rienner, 1990).

⁴⁰² Jolie Demmers, Alex E. Fernandez Jilberto, and Barbara Hogenboom, eds., *Miraculous Metamorphoses: The Neoliberalization of Latin American Populism* (New York: Palgrave, 2001); Paul Craig Roberts, *The Capitalist Revolution in Latin America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Sebastian Edwards, *Crisis and Reform in Latin America: From Despair to Hope* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); E. Wayne Nafziger, *African Capitalism: A Case Study in Nigerian Entrepreneurship* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1977); Francis G. Snyder, *Capitalism and Legal Change: An African Transformation* (New York: Academic Press, 1981); John Iliffe, *The Emergence of African Capitalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983); Paul Kennedy, *African Capitalism: The Struggle for Ascendancy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Jonathan Silas Zwingina, *Capitalist Development in an African Economy* (Ibadan, Nigeria: University Press, 1992); John Rapley, *Ivoirien Capitalism: African Entrepreneurs in Cote d'Ivoire* (Boulder, CO: Rienner, 1993); Ruth McVey, ed., *Southeast Asian Capitalists* (Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, 1992); Pradip K. Ghosh, ed., *Developing South Asia: A Modernization Perspective* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984); Krishnalekha Sood, *Trade and Economic Development: India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1989).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

technical assistance, the idea of Western imperialism lost its immediacy. The United States was no longer the imperialist nation it had long been portrayed to be. Rather, it had become a helpful developer to countries anxious to belong to the trading systems of the advanced industrialized states. When the script died in Europe, even if it survived in a modified form in Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam, and China, it died as a compelling force competing against the liberal technocratic order. The collective Western narrative followed totalitarianism to its logical end and buried it. The redeemer nation fought the Cold War in the direct path of Marxism-Leninism, and, true to its history and its self-defined mission, it remained as its rival crumbled to dust.⁴⁰³

This monograph does not attempt to add to the archive-based literature on the Cold War conflict from the perspectives of either international or American-based primary sources. Consistent with the thesis of this book, the present chapter on the orthodox period (and the ensuing chapters that carry the synthesis to the present post-Cold War period) focuses on the larger themes of international history in the twentieth century. The ideas that develop in this narrative orient toward what John Lewis Gaddis has called the “tectonic” shifts of the Cold War. In the technocratic narrative, these ideas are the architecture for the Cold War’s international and American scripts. The purpose of those scripts remains what it was earlier in the century during the First World War, the interwar period, and the Second World War. The metascript for the West, established upon the religious and secular foundations of Western culture, remained the technocratic synthesis, the expansion of the scientific and industrial systems that define Western modernity.

There were and are different visions and concepts of modern utopia. Historical practice does not suggest that Western and American cultures are privileged above non-Western cultures in viewing any point of the past, distant or recent. However, the underlying questions that concern any world conflict remain the same, irrespective of the respondent. Where is/was the international system headed? What were the origins of the conflict and what does it mean? The Cold War followed the world through nearly half a century of global change. That change has many descriptions. “Modernization” remains a term used by social scientists to describe the transformation of social systems.⁴⁰⁴ I have used the phrase “liberal technocratic order” to describe the period in world history from the First World War to the present. In this context, the Cold War was a process of that order, in which liberalism and technocracy organized the global political economy. On its surface, the world viewed through eyes of journalists appeared chaotic, random, and capricious. Yet, underneath that chaos were complex relationships between scripted mechanisms for global and national order.

⁴⁰³Saxonberg, *The Fall*, 3–34; Maier, *Dissolution*, 3–58.

⁴⁰⁴Marion J. Levy Jr., *Modernization and the Structure of Societies*, 2 vols. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1996); June Grasso, *Modernization and Revolution in China* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1997); Ronald Inglehart, *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997).

Briefly: The Origins

Amid chaos and horrific destruction, the Cold War rivalry began nearly concurrently with the end of the Second World War. Allied armies swarmed over the debris of the Third Reich. The West was in control of Italy, France, the Low Countries, Scandinavia, Greece, Turkey, and approximately two-thirds of the former German nation-state. The Soviets occupied Eastern Europe and East Germany. Readjusting territorial boundaries, they drove millions of ethnic Germans from their ancestral homelands and installed communist governments from Bulgaria on the Black Sea to the German Democratic Republic on the Baltic. In the areas of American and British control, anticommunist movements were given support and procommunist forces were suppressed. The reverse, with much harsher terms, was true in the Soviet sphere. Both sides understood quite early, much before Churchill's 1946 Iron Curtain speech or Truman's inauguration of what became known as the Truman Doctrine, that the new terms for world peace had to do with accommodating the rivalry between the West and the international communist movement.⁴⁰⁵

It was a natural corollary to the destruction of fascism that the ideological camps of the two surviving great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, would oppose each other. In the ruins of Eastern and Central Europe and what had been the Japanese empire, the Allies looked for the future reconstruction of an international system that would be friendly to their interests. Yet, Stalinism and liberal internationalism were inherently diametrically opposed to one another. American and British perceptions of Stalin and his regime were universally hostile. From being close wartime allies who shared victory over Nazism, within five years they had become enemies poised to wage yet another world war.

In American decision-making circles, prominent intellectuals advising the Truman administration reached the conclusion that the Soviet Union threatened the very survival the United States. Such beliefs were testimony not only to the shocking condition of the international community after the most destructive war in history, but to the profound consequences of the development of the atomic bomb. I have termed the early Cold War the "orthodox" period because of the extreme nature of the ideological positions of the liberal and Stalinist camps. It was a period characterized by a certain amount of rigidity and paranoia in American political culture, shown most notably by the phenomenon of McCarthyism.⁴⁰⁶ It was also a time of large-scale technocratic development, when the

⁴⁰⁵Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, 107–10; Paul A. Rahe, "The Beginning of the Cold War," in James W. Muller, ed., *Churchill's "Iron Curtain" Speech Fifty Years Later* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 49–67.

⁴⁰⁶Martin A. Trow, *Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance: A Study of Support for McCarthy in a New England Town* (New York: Arno Press, 1980); Richard M. Fried, *Nightmare in Red: The McCarthy Era in Perspective* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); M. J. Heale, *McCarthy's Americans: Red Scare Politics in State and Nation, 1935–1965* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998); Ellen Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes: McCarthyism in America* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1998).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

“power elite,” to cite C. Wright Mills’s famous book, and the “military-industrial complex,” to quote Dwight D. Eisenhower’s 1960 farewell address, thoroughly dominated the industrial-scientific-academic spheres of American society. Orthodoxy found Americans enraptured in a consensus-oriented culture that came to expect the possibility of a nuclear exchange with its foreign enemy as a believable scenario. The sinister nature of communism, in many respects open to dispute by historians today, was essential to the American script to wage war against evil. Clearly, there was evil and oppression from the vantage point of liberal ideology and culture. The American script, the orthodox script for the Cold War, was to “defend the free world.” It was, as the young John F. Kennedy said on the steps of the capitol building, to “bear any burden, meet any hardship...to assure the survival and the success of liberty.”⁴⁰⁷

Viewed in its entirety, the Cold War era, from Churchill’s 1946 Iron Curtain speech through the “velvet revolutions” of 1989, was a time that in many ways may or should only be described in superlatives. Indeed, in world history it was a period of enormous, even breathtaking development, albeit not necessarily beneficial. With significant change occurring in political, economic, social, and cultural domains globally and with the simultaneity expected in an era saturated by the mass media, the period humbles those who try to reduce it to a few simple principles of sociological and historical transformation. Political change, often radical but always significant, was found in the emergence of so many new and diverse nation-states. In the wake of nationalist movements, emboldened by the outcomes of the Second World War, decolonization erupted around the Third World. Their legacies became the communist, socialist, liberal, and fundamentalist movements that over decades changed the face of global politics. By the end of the Cold War, democratic movements, including those related to native peoples, ethnic minorities, women, and others in the economic and social underclass, were seeded throughout the Third World. The pyramidal scheme of the pre-Cold War global community showed Europe and North America commanding the earth. Yet, by the last decade of the twentieth century, the nature of internationalism had shifted from the West to a new concept of globalism. Understanding the world as a political entity in 1990 was a far cry from understanding it in the mid-1940s. The division of the world between liberals and revolutionary socialists had forced a reinterpretation of the structure of global politics. In particular, it forced a new understanding of the relationship between the core of advanced industrialized states and the periphery of colonial and postcolonial underdevelopment.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁷*Text of Kennedy’s inaugural address outlining policies on world peace and freedom*, New York Times, January 21, 1961, p. 8; Mills, *The Power Elite*, 198–241; Gregg B. Walker, David A. Bella, and Steven J. Sprecher, eds., *The Military-Industrial Complex: Eisenhower’s Warning Three Decades Later* (New York: P. Lang, 1992).

⁴⁰⁸Valentine Udoh James, ed., *Sustainable Development in Third World Countries: Applied and Theoretical Perspectives* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996); Jennifer Elliot, *Introduction to Sustainable Development* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

Indochina, which was nothing more than a French colony until 1945, was divided into four nation-states by the 1950s. By the end of the Cold War, it was an area that had links to both the capitalist and the dying Soviet socialist system. This was because the older form of imperialism that had settled in the European empires of the nineteenth century was gone, faced with the imposing demands of the Cold War, by the mid-twentieth. In its place came American and East Asian capitalism and the liberal technocratic order. The Cold War had taken part in the creation of the nation-states of the former French Indochina. Cold War institutions built the Vietnamese and Cambodian and Laotian states. By the end of the 1980s, Vietnam in particular was an emerging power in the region. Yet, the Cold War had pushed Vietnam once more into the orbit of the international capitalist culture of the West. Independence, a cherished concept coterminous with nationalism in Vietnamese culture, remained a paradoxical issue for a global political economy that exerted enormous pressure to integrate and compartmentalize entire societies into the capitalist scientific-industrial system of the advanced states.⁴⁰⁹

The Cold War found two rival industrial systems working to expand a technocratic global culture that linked elite groups on every continent. This political and economic transformation included profound demographic change. The modernization programs tied to the Cold War rivalry contributed to the vast population explosion that tripled, quadrupled, and quintupled national populations over the course of less than half a century. Basic provisions for public health and nutrition led to enormous population growth in the Third World. This growth forced deep problems still deeper in countries that had no functioning class of people who were trained to govern a modern Western-like society. During the twentieth century, the geographical science of demography improved its data collection and analytical tools. By the end of the Cold War, impressive charts and tables showed the comparative ages and growth rates of human populations around the world. There were twice as many people on earth when the Cold War ended as when it began. With higher populations, there were much higher levels of human consumption and environmental stress. Western consumer cultures, the socialist countries, and the Third World all contributed to the global destruction of natural ecosystems through human settlement, industrial pollution, and deforestation. Scientists had begun to warn of the consequences of ecological change, including the most worrisome thesis: that hydrocarbon emissions threatened a rise in atmospheric temperatures that would warm the earth, force the disappearance of the polar ice regions, and usher in potentially catastrophic consequences.⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁹David G. Marr, ed., *Postwar Vietnam: Dilemmas in Socialist Development* (Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asian Studies Program, Cornell University, 1988); William S. Turley and Mark Selden, eds., *Reinventing Vietnamese Socialism: Doi Moi in Comparative Perspective* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993); Eero Palmujoki, *Vietnam and the World: Marxist-Leninist Doctrine and the Changes in International Relations, 1975–93* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997).

⁴¹⁰Roderick J. McIntosh, Joseph A. Tainter, and Susan Keech McIntosh, eds., *The Way the Wind Blows: Climate, History, and Human Action* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); James J. McCarthy, ed., *Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*:

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Outstanding changes in the standard of living occurred in much of the industrialized world. There were many more cars, and larger homes with air conditioning, television sets, and all the new electronic devices that began to become commonplace in American, European, and Japanese homes, beginning in the 1980s. It was normal, even expected, in many affluent communities in the West, that to live the good life, individuals and families would need to maximize the use of natural resources in the form of fossil fuel energy, fresh water, forests, and arable land. Even as massive nuclear arsenals, including bombers, submarines, and land-based deterrents sat opposite one another over thousands of miles of land and ocean, the Cold War remained in the background.

In the Third World, however, the feted affluence of upper-middle-class citizens in the advanced industrialized world was irrelevant. Of greater consequence were the simpler but far more desperate problems of abject poverty that these societies faced. Here came the failure not only of socialism, but of liberal capitalism as well. Despite the intentions of the liberal order, the Third World grew on average poorer and its problems became more intractable than before. This happened despite the focus that the redeemer nation placed on the vast underdeveloped regions in Africa, Asia, and the Americas. The Cold War had much of the Third World as a battleground. Aid to military regimes loyal to the United States flowed from Congress to often corrupt officials. In the end, the missions and foreign aid programs accomplished far less than they hoped for the huge regions between the oceans that American forces protected against the possibility of communist envelopment. By the end of the Cold War, despite profound global change, including the extraordinary production of material wealth, more poverty existed in the world than at the end of the Second World War. Perhaps, in this effect, the redeemer nation's script had failed, as had the scripted intentions of the other liberal powers that had attempted unsuccessfully to change the underdeveloped world. Collectively, they worked their missions according to the traditions of progressive internationalism that began with Woodrow Wilson.⁴¹¹

Over half a century, from the atomic bomb era of the late 1940s to the digital and biotechnology revolutions of the end of the century, technological development swept world civilization toward the vision of which the Cold War futurists were so confident. The technocratic world of 1945, dominated by the technocratic civilizations of North America and Europe, would become far more technocratic by the 1990s. The automobile of 1950 was mainly a thick steel frame with large plain rubber tires, powered by a

Contribution of Working Group II to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (*New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001*).

⁴¹¹James H. Mittelman, *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Caroline Thomas, *Global Governance, Development and Human Security: The Challenge of Poverty and Inequality* (London: Pluto Press, 2000); Christopher L. Ilbert and David Vines, eds., *The World Bank: Structure and Policies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 87–156; Howard White and Tony Killick, *African Poverty at the Millennium: Causes, Complexities, and Challenges* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2001).

powerful but rudimentary combustion engine. The vehicle had no emission controls for the high-octane leaded fuel that it ran on, nor did it have the electronic sensors and communication devices that later generations of automobiles would have. In sum, it was a machine with thick, heavy mechanical parts that used the thick, heavy hydrocarbon fuels that the industrial revolution had discovered to power its steel-based machine culture. Yet, over the course of the international conflict that sustained technological competition for the rest of the century, the nature of the automobile as an industrial-scientific product changed profoundly. The automobiles of the 1990s reflected the new technocratic civilization; control mechanisms were literally embedded in the new cars, including engine sensors and the new global positioning system (GPS) devices that luxury cars added in toward the end of the decade. The digital revolution promised a new political economy, a new basis for the production and distribution of knowledge. In effect, the new technological revolution promised a new level of civilization that would transcend the Cold War. It promised to surpass the endemic problems of the nation-state and perhaps the biological and psychological frailties of all human beings and their cultures.⁴¹²

All of this technological promise was centered around the mid-century encounter between the American and Stalinist camps as they viewed the international system and developed the script for the next four decades. The strategic confrontation drove technology to sustain a military revolution. The world community, divided between massive nuclear arsenals and conventional military forces for forty-five years, would end the period with the steady integration of Western cosmopolitanism and its new scientific-industrial culture, based upon electronic quantification. The technocratic script, embedded in the technocratic orders of both liberalism and socialism, moved the world through the Cold War, albeit in often chaotic and destructive fashions. What had not changed, and in fact had continued to grow, were the severe problems of underdevelopment in the world's many peripheries. When the Eastern European revolutions of 1989 and the Soviet revolution of 1991 ended the bipolar conflict, the enormity of the Cold War's technological or technocratic revolution had hardly touched isolated poor communities around the world. The people who lived on most of the earth's surface, and who hugely outnumbered the sophisticated elites in the urban centers of the world's core, had only a supporting role in the titanic rivalry between the Marxist-Leninists and the liberal internationalists. Ultimately, the Cold War and its potent actor, the redeemer nation, as agents of technocratic order, would bear primary significance in the reconstruction of the modern world.

Over decades of military and ideological confrontation, the epistemologies and institutions of the Cold War multiplied in depth and complexity. The rapid accumulation

⁴¹²Kurzweil, *The Age of Spiritual Machines* (New York: Viking, 1999); Bruce Mazlish, *The Fourth Discontinuity: The Co-evolution of Humans and Machines* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993); Rodney A. Brooks, *Flesh and Machines: How Robots Will Change Us* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2002); John M. Walker and Ralph Rapley, eds., *Molecular Biology and Biotechnology* (Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry, 2000).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

of human knowledge made this process inevitable. Prior to this period, there were no space systems, microcomputers, optical lasers, or any number of technologies that were facilitated by the military competition between the superpowers. In the United States and in other major industrialized countries, all the social and policy sciences as well as the physical and natural were well funded and given to rapid development throughout the age of nuclear confrontation. By the time the Cold War had ended, the nature of knowledge and the structure of world politics, commerce, and communication had undergone immeasurable change. Electronic computers, born from the compelling needs of the Second World War, were transformed by the military rivalry between the superpowers. Military technology, the beneficiary of almost unlimited funding, underwent rapid and continuous revolutions. In the 1940s, jet aircraft and atomic weapons were among the most potent of the new weapons systems. The 1950s produced thermonuclear weapons, atomic-powered submarines and aircraft carriers, and the first generation of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The succeeding decades made improvements on these weapons, including larger and more accurate missiles that could carry either nuclear or conventional warheads.⁴¹³

The extent to which each superpower built its doomsday arsenals of thermonuclear devices was almost incomprehensible. In the space of half a generation, the aggregate power of the nuclear arsenals dwarfed the combined conventional power of the world's largest militaries. By the early 1960s, the American arsenal alone was several hundred thousand times as powerful as the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. By the end of the Cold War, each side had maintained its "throw weights" beyond the means of conventional warfare, measured in multiples of the hypothetical destruction of the entire human race—if not from the blasts, then from the nuclear winter that was reckoned soon to follow. By the 1980s there were thousands of nuclear weapons that possessed multiple precision warheads or MIRVs (multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles) that each side deployed against the other. With the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) the nuclear scenario became impossible to manage. The combined range of nuclear and conventional weapons systems supported by the superpowers had become overwhelming in its global projection of power and in its absolute destructiveness.⁴¹⁴

⁴¹³Brodie, *Strategy in the Missile Age*, 147–72; Sherry, *The Rise of American Air Power*, 177–218; Donald Mackenzie, *Inventing Accuracy: A Historical Sociology of Nuclear Missile Guidance* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993); Francis Duncan, *Rickover and the Nuclear Navy: The Discipline of Technology* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1990).

⁴¹⁴Fitzgerald, *Way out There in the Blue*, 210–64; Harold Brown, ed., *The Strategic Defense Initiative: Shield or Snare?* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987); Douglas C. Waller, *The Strategic Defense Initiative, Progress and Challenges: A Guide to Issues and References* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987); Thomas Graham Jr., *Disarmament Sketches: Three Decades of Arms Control and International Law* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002); Ronald E. Powaski, *Return to Armageddon*, 14–82; Paul P. Craig, John A. Jungerman, and Steven J. Zaloga, *Nuclear Arms Race: Technology and Society* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985); Steven J. Zaloga, *Target America: The Soviet Union and the Strategic Arms Race, 1945–1964* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1993); Robbin F. Laird, *The Soviet Union, the West, and the Nuclear Arms Race* (New

When Reagan and Gorbachev met in Iceland in 1986, a confluence in the Cold War's narrative brought the two men together. Both men understood the practical and indeed compelling need to end the Cold War, and in that context, genuine ideas were broached for bringing the conflict to an end. Armageddon had been threatened for decades by nuclear arsenals of gargantuan proportions. The nuclear Cold War confronted humankind with an imminent sense of its own mortality. It confronted serious thinkers in Europe, North America and the rest of the world with the idea of human extinction through the power of technology. The prospect of human disappearance caused by nuclear winter prompted the astronomer Carl Sagan to argue that the possibility of human extinction would deprive the earth of literally millions of years of future generations of human beings. What was clear to Americans at the end of the Cold War was also clear near its beginning. To Truman, just as it was to Eisenhower and Kennedy and all their successors, the technocratic age of nuclear physics and rocket science promised the alternate possibilities of a golden age or an age of catastrophe. To quote Kennedy, "Man had the power to build and the power to destroy"; it was up to man, through his intelligence and courage, to work with the agency of the moment to decide which it would be.⁴¹⁵

Cold War Epistemology

As suggested, the institutional and intellectual history of the Cold War was of enormous complexity. The epistemologies of the Cold War were connected to every aspect of human development as well as to the balance of power. The physical universe was a theoretical construct that had undergone enormous change in the first half of the twentieth century. It bore upon the Cold War in the general rivalry for scientific superiority, but also in the applied aspects of physics in nuclear research and the space technology that had landed Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin on the lunar surface. In every area of science and technology, the exponential growth of technocratic knowledge was the paradigm. Knowledge disciplines that served the Cold War were numerous, important, and burgeoning. In the context of the all-consuming rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, physical science, biological science, and behavioral, administrative, and policy-oriented disciplines all served the multiple tasks and purposes assigned by different dimensions of national security.⁴¹⁶

York: New York University Press, 1986), 3–82; Mary C. Fitzgerald, Changing Soviet Doctrine on Nuclear War (Alexandria, VA: Center for Naval Analyses, 1986).

⁴¹⁵ Archie Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 232–33; Joseph G. Whelan, *The Moscow Summit, 1988: Reagan and Gorbachev in Negotiation* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1990); Carl Sagan and Richard P. Turco, *A Path Where No Man Thought: Nuclear Winter and the End of the Arms Race* (New York: Random House, 1990), 159–219.

⁴¹⁶ Cumings, *Parallax Visions*, 174–204; Ira Katznelson, "The Subtle Politics of Developing Emergency: Political Science as Liberal Guardianship," in Noam Chomsky, ed., *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years* (New York: New Press, 1997), 233–58; Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science*, 14–43.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Physics was, of course, the critical discipline for the nuclear Cold War, from thermonuclear devices to the projected antiballistic missile systems of the 1980s and beyond. Chemical and biological research, both funded by military and civilian federal grants, supported the Cold War in weapons development as well as in the industrial and agricultural projects related to modernization. With respect to the Cold War, one use of biological knowledge was oriented toward biological weapons of mass destruction, at least until the United States government, under the Nixon administration, gave up such weapons systems. Chemistry too, in addition to its extraordinary impact on all aspects of industry, had military uses related to weapons of mass destruction. In all of the physical sciences, the production of new knowledge worked with the expansion of the means of national security. In addition to deadly weapons, the physical, natural, mathematical, and engineering sciences developed ever more complex systems for observation and control. Control was extended not only to such physical systems as the monitoring of Soviet communications and nuclear installations or the climate patterns found in the Northern Hemisphere; it extended to human systems as well. Such systems might include political institutions, demography, economic resources and production, and international patterns of public opinion. Observation and control, fundamental to all scientific approaches to knowledge, were fundamental to the Cold War's institutional history. In this sense, science became a thoroughly Cold War epistemology. Without the Cold War, the *raison d'être* for what became known as "Cold War science" would have disappeared. The massive production of knowledge for the expansion of systems of international control would never have flowered in the first place.⁴¹⁷

The formal distinction between scientific research and the development of technology became blurred. This was so mainly because of the institutional linkages between public and private sectors that connected the state with corporate interests. The distinction was lost in the flow of publicly financed knowledge between civilian and military research programs. The technological transition of the mid-1980s, "Star Wars," and other quintessential Cold War science/defense projects suggested the path of change over the century. The high-tech defense systems were symbolic of the transition from the industrial systems of a machine civilization to the more quantified and electronic civilization that began to emerge during the 1960s and 1970s. The postmodern economy of service and information-based wealth, the very meaning of the post-Cold War's digital economy, was the logical production of the technocratic epistemologies of the Cold War.⁴¹⁸

As noted, the American Cold War produced a scientific and engineering culture that would ultimately transcend the international political rivalry between the superpowers. In a cosmopolitan culture that worshiped and imagined the future on a daily basis, the technocratic script that drove invention tried to enact the future within the confines of the

⁴¹⁷Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science*, 233–56.

⁴¹⁸For the fusion of national security and information science, see Richard L. Kugler and Ellen L. Frost, eds., *The Global Century: Globalization and National Security*, vols. 1 & 2 (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 2001).

present. As the country moved through decades of nuclear standoff and international competition with its rivals, the cultural products of the American Cold War revealed much about the internal dynamics of the nation as a collective script. The science fiction of *Star Trek*, *Star Wars*, and *2001: A Space Odyssey*, among others, suggested the intentions of the metascript within American society. America, as the redeemer nation, continued to triumph over evil in most of the fantasies created by Hollywood. That triumph was true and repetitive whether that evil was represented by the mythical Darth Vader or the Klingon Empire. The genesis of American victory was always a balancing of ingenuity with the technological dimension, as in the post-Cold War Independence Day. The rivalry between American science and its liberal culture was always an important theme in movies, television, and other art forms. The tension between the technocratic requirements of control, scientific precision, and order always had to be balanced in American Cold War mythology with the equal desire of Americans for autonomy and liberty within a technocratic state.⁴¹⁹

The international political history of the Cold War paralleled simultaneous other Cold Wars. Those were the Cold Wars in science, technology, and culture. On one level, the long rivalry of Soviet, American, and Chinese nation-states showed intense regional competitions for influence. Western and communist political and military powers confronted one another through the crises and proxy wars of Korea, Vietnam, Taiwan, Cuba, Eastern Europe, Central America, the Middle East, Afghanistan, and Africa. Power relationships and political ideology reverberated from the Cold War capitals of the advanced countries through the expanses of desert, bush, forests, and mountains that compose much of the Third World and the earth's surface. On other levels, however, Cold War politics, the dynamic interior of nations and regions struggling with conflict—ethnic, religious, and ideological—remained in the background. Political interiors were overshadowed by the race to scientific and technological achievements.

On a technocratic level, the Cold War involved rival production systems for managing technocratic phenomena. In each society, as the Cold War progressed, technology developed original systems for the management of environments. Computers, satellites, and sophisticated professional languages based upon different branches of mathematics worked to control economic and social systems, resources, and transportation and communication networks. They also worked to manage advanced military and intelligence systems of the highest order. On one level, the “space race” juxtaposed the

⁴¹⁹Jay Goulding, *Empire, Aliens, and Conquest: A Critique of American Ideology in Star Trek and Other Science Fiction Adventures* (Toronto: Sisyphus Press, 1985); Taylor Harrison, ed., *Enterprise Zones: Critical Positions on Star Trek* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996); David Seed, *American Science Fiction and the Cold War: Literature and Film* (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1999); Susan M. Matarese, *American Foreign Policy and the Utopian Imagination* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001); Sharona Ben-Tov, *The Artificial Paradise: Science Fiction and American Reality* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995); Gary Westfahl, ed., *Space and Beyond: The Frontier Theme in Science Fiction* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

military prowess of the United States with that of the Soviet Union. On another level, it was a contest for the production of the technocratic. The launching of Sputnik in 1957 shook the foundations of American society, creating a level of anxiety heretofore unknown. Indeed, the space race was a contest, if ultimately only a symbolic one, for the domination of technocratic knowledge.⁴²⁰

I have termed it a symbolic contest because retrospectively it may have been a vast chimera created by mistaken beliefs in the efficacy of socialism as a form of political economy. Therefore, the historical claim of genuine competition between the United States and the Soviet Union for the creation of the new technocratic civilization was perhaps nonexistent. Through enormous effort, the Soviets were able to compete with the West in the production of military technology until virtually the end of the Cold War.⁴²¹ However, science and technology under liberalism were vastly more creative, innovative, and expansive than under the state socialism of the Soviet bloc. The bureaucratic structures of state socialism could never hope to match the effective production and innovation of new technologies that liberal market-oriented societies are capable of. The liberal technocratic script allowed institutions to shape agendas in all the sciences, including, as a number of recent scholarly works have explored, the social sciences. Liberal science, unlike its socialist counterpart, provided the range of dissent and independence that allowed many scientists, including social scientists, to challenge existing paradigms and, in the private sector, to develop new technologies in response to the seamless flow of economic information that markets provide. The market's triumph over socialist dogma would be slow coming. Even at the end of the Cold War itself in the 1980s, with capitalism's preeminent performance in any number of fields—from service-oriented industries such as finance and retail to scientific industries such as pharmaceuticals, precision instruments, and electronic data processing—its legitimacy remained less than universal. The beliefs of both Marxist-Leninists and European social democrats inspired a condescending attitude toward capitalism and the idea of markets in any form. Yet, as the economic history of the last two centuries has shown, the liberal script did and very much still does allow for intellectual freedom (albeit a form of

⁴²⁰Robert A. Divine, *The Sputnik Challenge* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Eugene Cernan, *The Last Man on the Moon: Astronaut Eugene Cernan and America's Race in Space* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999); Siddiqi, *Challenge to Apollo*; David H. DeVorkin, *Science with a Vengeance: How the Military Created the U.S. Space Sciences after World War II* (New York: Springer, 1992); Paul B. Stares, *The Militarization of Space: U.S. Policy, 1945–1984* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985); McDougall, *The Heavens and the Earth*, 234–97.

⁴²¹Library of Congress, *Soviet Space Programs: Organization, Plans, Goals, and International Implications, Staff Report Prepared for the Use of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, United States Senate* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1962); U.S. Department of Defense, *Soviet Strategic and Space Programs* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1990); Thomas B. Cochran, *Making the Russian Bomb: From Stalin to Yeltsin* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001), 31–51; Christoph Bluth, *Soviet Strategic Arms Policy before SALT* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 40–120.

cognitive liberty with institutional boundaries), which was the very basis for the expansion of prosperity.

The Beginning of the Orthodox Phase: The Children of Light

Once more let us return to the beginning of the Cold War at the end of the Second World War. All over Eastern Europe and the Soviet occupation zone in Germany, communist movements loyal to the international and under the direction of the Soviet party began to establish regimes. “The children of light,” to adopt the term the Protestant theologian Reinhold Niebuhr used to describe liberal democracy at the end of the Second World War, faced the surviving totalitarian regimes of Europe.⁴²²

The orthodox Cold War began in the very last months of the Second World War as Europe and Germany were formally and informally divided between the West and the Soviets. It ended sometime in the mid-1960s when the orthodox view of the world came under challenge. After the Cuban Missile Crisis and before Johnson’s 1965 press conference speech, the Soviet-American relationship began to change. In American terms, the orthodox period began and was bounded by the fear of communism and a third world war and ended with the beginning of the Vietnam antiwar movement, the Sino-Soviet split, and the nuclear test ban treaty of 1963. The culture and the script turned with the counterculture and the rest of the phenomena of the late 1960s and early 1970s, bringing the domino theory and the House Un-American Activities Committee to ignominious ends. Yet, all of this was later. In the first years of the Cold War, the Soviet threat was nearly all that mattered.⁴²³

In the orthodox period, America continued its war preparedness, mobilizing national resources for civil defense and a global war that would contain both conventional and nuclear components. The psychological dimensions of orthodoxy were as Earnest May described them in his study of historical memory and international history. May suggested that the country looked at the Soviets as the successor to the Third Reich. From the Truman administration through the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the institutional structure of American national security expanded horizontally and vertically. The extent of expansion was defined by the Cold War agenda. From the late 1940s to the early 1960s, the country was prepared, psychologically and politically, to return to war

⁴²²Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of Its Traditional Defence* (New York: Scribner’s, 1945).

⁴²³Arthur Koestler, *Darkness at Noon* (New York: Random House, 1941); Melvyn P. Leffler, *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917–1953* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1994); Richard Gid Powers, *Not without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism* (New York: Free Press, 1995); David Callahan, *Dangerous Capabilities: Paul Nitze and the Cold War* (New York: Harper & Row, 1990); Lisle A. Rose, *The Cold War Comes to Main Street: America in 1950* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999); Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta Books, 1999); Kenneth D. Rose, *One Nation Underground: The Fallout Shelter in American Culture* (New York: New York University Press, 2001); Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy*.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

once more to defeat a totalitarian adversary. By necessity, the containment strategy required a global plan for the implementation of a highly integrated political-military-economic-scientific program for the expansion of American power. In political terms, the patterns of American behavior were quite consistent. American diplomacy supported virtually all regimes publicly opposed to communism, irrespective of their internal policies. The orthodox pattern of continuous and unequivocal support to right-wing regimes carried well beyond the first period of the Cold War. In fact, with few exceptions, support of political allies, no matter how hypocritical and corrupt the policy, was a rule that rarely was broken.

Since communism was seen as an insidious global movement, political and military support was arranged both publicly and covertly. The Central Intelligence Agency, founded immediately after the war with the 1947 National Security Act, was instrumental in support of antidemocratic movements everywhere within the purview of American influence. The agency supported authoritarian anticommunist movements in Japan and the rest of East Asia, as well as in Latin America and Europe. Under executive authority, CIA operatives sponsored coups in Iran, Ghana, Guatemala, Iraq, and elsewhere. The CIA supported authoritarian regimes in every region of the world, without significant qualms about democratic rights. The orthodox Cold War may be distinguished from the later periods of the conflict by the unquestioning obedience of American public opinion to the anticommunist policies of the state. Although leftists throughout Latin America were outraged in the extreme by the CIA-sponsored coup against the duly elected government of Guatemala in 1954, American public opinion was deluded into believing the theory that the coup leaders, a seedy group of CIA operatives, were actually freedom fighters opposing communist tyranny. The use of authoritarian regimes to serve American strategic interests was well defined and unchallenged during the orthodox period, if only because of the cloud of self-righteousness that enveloped a society dominated by its own tightly woven propaganda culture.⁴²⁴

That said, provocative as it may sound to some readers, the redeemer nation was not naive about the Soviet Union or the international communist movement. The orthodox images of communism were extraordinarily dark. They portrayed a society of absolute evil, capable of extinguishing the most basic of human freedoms. This image, long doubted by American liberals before the end of the Cold War, became a truism during the

⁴²⁴Richard Immerman, *The CIA in Guatemala: The Foreign Policy of Intervention* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982); Stephen Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer, *Bitter Fruit: The Story of the American Coup in Guatemala* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Latin American Studies Center, 1999); Michael McClintock, *State Terror and Popular Resistance in Guatemala* (London: Zed Books, 1985); U.S. Congress, *Report on the Guatemala Review of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1997); Zachary Karabell, *Architects of Intervention: The United States, the Third World, and the Cold War, 1946–1962* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999); Peter L. Hahn and Mary Ann Heiss, eds., *Empire and Revolution: The United States and the Third World since 1945* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2001).

post-Cold War period of revelations. It appeared that communism in most of its variations was largely totalitarian. In its extreme, communism was fully capable of mass persecutions, induced famines, and what can only be described as a form of genocide. Defending the free world, as the planners of the containment doctrine understood their mission, was a factually correct assessment of the situation, with the proviso that in the defense of liberal civilization, an even larger camp of the authoritarian anticommunist world was incorporated under the rubric of “free nations.”⁴²⁵

During the orthodox period, opposing totalitarianism was an all-encompassing task. There was a defined symmetry in the early American Cold War that incorporated domestic and international responses to the new bipolar system. The national script maintained the Second World War’s Judeo-Christian myth that good triumphs over evil; darkness and light were delineated clearly, as they were to Americans in previous confrontations with their adversaries. Within the strict dichotomy between the angels and Satan, a policy with diplomatic and strategic nuances could not be elucidated in public rhetoric. So, for example, all the presidential administrations of the orthodox period, from 1945 to 1965, maintained diplomatic channels with the Soviet bloc, even when public opinion provided no rewards for doing so. Even though Stalin and Mao were responsible for tens of millions of dead, and were as doctrinaire in their anti-Americanism as Americans were in their anticommunism, the operative diplomacy of the United States was multifaceted and multilateral. The extreme “rollback” doctrines that were tied to the far right in American politics would never gain the political legitimacy needed to enact the “liberation” of the communists from themselves. In all the policies of the period, a balance always had to be struck within the American state between competing domestic constituencies.⁴²⁶

In the end, political interests and ideology had to be reconciled through the mechanisms of the script. It was fine for the Eisenhower administration to arrange a twenty-one-gun salute in Washington, a ticker-tape parade in New York City, and honorary degrees from Fordham and Columbia for Castillo Armas, handpicked leader of the CIA for the staged Guatemalan revolution, even if the government knew he was just what he was, a stooge. It was also ideologically consistent and rational for John F. Kennedy to pronounce the praetorian regimes of Latin America as “free” or Vietnam under the Ngo family to be an integral part of the “free world.”⁴²⁷ Principles that were

⁴²⁵Powers, *Not without Honor*; Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 373–80; James D. Burnham, *Containment or Liberation? An Inquiry into the Aims of United States Foreign Policy* (New York: J. Day, 1953).

⁴²⁶Barry M. Goldwater, *The Conscience of a Conservative* (Shepherdsville, KY: Victor, 1960) and *Why Not Victory?*; Curtis E. LeMay, *America Is in Danger* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968); David Reisman and Nathan Glazer, “*The Intellectuals and the Discontented Classes*,” in Daniel Bell, ed., *Radical Right* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002), 150–59; Cumings, *The Roaring of the Cataract*, 79–121.

⁴²⁷Immerman, *The CIA in Guatemala*, 180; John F. Kennedy, “*Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union*,” January 14, 1963, in *Public Papers of the Presidents*, 1963 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1964), 11–19.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

dear to Woodrow Wilson were less dear to many of his successors who were more willing to sacrifice high ideals for instrumental gains. Yet, this was what the national script required leaders to do. It was always necessary to behave in a contradictory manner if the political dynamics of any situation called for it. National scripts opposed one another in the Cold War, fed by centuries of internal development. The Western and American metascript met the Russian, Chinese, Vietnamese, and hundreds of other scripts in the constellation of narratives that define the contemporary international system. It would take a working out of those script mechanisms related to communism, anticommunism, modernization, and Westernization to bring the world fully along the path of development to a post-Cold War world in which the whole concept of political ideologies and international relations was open to question or redefinition.

Orthodox Ideologies: Modes of Understanding

In the foreign policy system of any large nation-state, different roles are acquired in the management of diplomacy. There have always been distinct political, military, and economic considerations, and different roles support the separate interests of the state in each area. Naturally, diplomats tend to view the international system in terms of political motives and interests. Their interpretations have lent themselves to questions of international law, the terms and tone of political relationships between sovereign states, and the political consequences, domestic and international, of the use of force in any crisis. In contrast, professional soldiers in any branch of the armed forces view national interests principally in strategic terms. They understand international relations as military realists. The military view or ideology supported the balance-of-power perspective and the objective determination of national interests reflected in strategic security considerations. From the military's Cold War perspective, the country's vital interests were indeed global and strategic—and the use of force, when in support of the containment structure or in any engagement, had to be decisive.⁴²⁸

Generals and diplomats, by virtue of their separate cultures and roles, contributed three particular modes of understanding to American foreign relations. Political realism appraised national interest in strict realist political terms. From this perspective, the political costs of any foreign policy must be weighed against long-term political benefits. George Ball, the most famous dissenter over the ground war in Vietnam, was a classic political realist. He was critical of the military perspective of the orthodox period, which viewed conflict with the communist world as inevitable and necessary, and which sought to use force in what he considered dangerous and excessive ways. He was also critical of

⁴²⁸Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 12–13; Jacques Van Doorn, “Ideology and the Military,” in Morris Janowitz and Jacques van Doorn, eds., *On Military Ideology* (Rotterdam: Rotterdam University Press, 1971), xv–xxix; Jack Snyder, *The Ideology of the Offensive: Military Decision Making and the Disasters of 1914* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984); Harry G. Summers, *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1984); Nathan Twining, *Neither Liberty nor Safety: A Hard Look at U.S. Military Policy and Strategy* (New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston, 1966).

neo-Wilsonian programs that combined altruism with a Keynesian mission to transform the world through foreign aid. Finally, as we will discuss, he was critical of the technocrats who balanced political and military intervention without a critical understanding of the cost and risk involved. Ball's realism was similar to the thinking of George Kennan, Walter Lippmann, and Hans Morgenthau, who also viewed Vietnam, and the Cold War in general, as an international political conflict in which the use of force was dangerous, and political resources needed to be husbanded to protect well-defined national interests.⁴²⁹

The other political perspective, which we may term Wilsonian or neo-Wilsonian, departs from political realism on the fundamental question of national interest. Woodrow Wilson and his spiritual descendants in American foreign affairs had a broad, progressive vision of American national interest. Whereas political and military realists were loath to define America's mission beyond its demonstrable strategic, political, and economic interests, Wilsonians were more than willing to define America's mission as global and coterminous with the democratization of the world. This mission was to be achieved through the support of democratic movements, but also through the active support of economic and public infrastructure development to make democracy possible. This did not mean that neo-Wilsonians were opposed to the use of force. Although neo-Wilsonian ideology, whose exemplars were Adlai Stevenson, John F. Kennedy, and William Proxmire, among others, viewed the use of force as a negative response to the failure of political negotiation within the context of international law, neo-Wilsonians were still ready to pursue military options. Some Wilsonian-oriented diplomats, such as Dean Rusk, supported the Vietnam War with passion (as he did the Korean War), but did so within the context of Wilsonian foreign policy objectives. John F. Kennedy was a distinctly Wilsonian figure in American foreign relations. He blocked military action against the Soviets throughout his presidency, including during the Berlin Crisis of 1961–1962 and the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. Nonetheless, he expanded the idea of containment doctrine by formally incorporating worldwide “counterinsurgency” operations into the containment system.⁴³⁰

In their perspectives and actions in world affairs, Truman and Eisenhower may not be considered strictly Wilsonian. However, the human mind has always been capable of holding and using multiple perspectives to comprehend reality. Truman's life script contained a host of experiences, from ancestral memories of the Civil War and nineteenth-century Midwestern culture to his roles in public life. He was an officer during the First World War, a U.S. senator during the Second World War, and then finally

⁴²⁹Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 11–13; George W. Ball, *The Past Has Another Pattern: Memoirs* (New York: Norton, 1982); James A. Bill, *George Ball: Behind the Scenes in U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997); Hans J. Morgenthau, *Vietnam and the United States* (Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press 1965), 38–49, and *Truth and Power: Essays of a Decade, 1960–70* (New York: Praeger, 1970), 398–431; George F. Kennan, *Around the Cragged Hill: A Personal and Political Philosophy* (New York: Norton, 1993), 180–231.

⁴³⁰Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 158–59, 174–75.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

became president of the United States just weeks after he was sworn in as vice president during the last months of the conflict. Like his predecessors and all of his successors in the twentieth century, Truman carried the progressive legacy of Woodrow Wilson into office. At the same time, his commitment to internationalism was tempered by the military and political realism imparted by war.⁴³¹

Likewise, Dwight D. Eisenhower carried multiple perspectives into office as well. In addition to his military career, he too was an inheritor of American culture. When Eisenhower assumed the presidency at age sixty-three, he had lived around the world, exposed to the cultures of East Asia and Europe. Most recently, he had served as president of a major East Coast university. What made him a Wilsonian at the height of the Cold War in the 1950s was his commitment to economic development and the United Nations as a world body. To a degree, this is what he had inherited from Harry Truman and Franklin Roosevelt. A greater inheritance, however, was the impetus of American civilization in the twentieth century. From the end of the Second World War, feeding and clothing the world and supporting the rule of law had guided the American script like an arrow. Paradoxically, the script also called for a repudiation of Wilsonianism, through both open and covert support for antidemocratic regimes. The contradiction of simultaneous support for authoritarian anticommunism and the promotion of liberal culture created a wellspring of anti-Americanism around the world. However, the collective script of a nation-state is always a compromise. It is a synchronization of other collective narratives, and this often requires paradoxical choices in public policy. Successive American administrations promoted democracy and economic liberalism in Latin America, the Middle East, and East Asia. At the very same time, the United States trained police and military forces to crush resistance movements and to support the praetorian and personalist rule of American allies such as the Somozas in Nicaragua, Papa Doc in Haiti, Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, and Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam.⁴³²

Despite these contradictions in American policy, there were distinct Wilsonian aspects in both Truman and Eisenhower.⁴³³ Extensive foreign aid programs in the 1940s and

⁴³¹Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, 448–93; Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 729–34; Paul G. Pierpaoli Jr., *Truman and Korea: The Political Culture of the Early Cold War* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 16–81; Shawn J. Parry-Giles, *The Rhetorical Presidency, Propaganda, and the Cold War, 1945–1955* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002); Sara L. Sale, *The Shaping of Containment: Harry S. Truman, the National Security Council, and the Cold War* (Saint James, NY: Brandywine Press, 1998); David McCullough, *Truman* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992), 723–923.

⁴³²Blanche Weisen Cook, *The Declassified Eisenhower* (New York: Penguin Books, 1984), 218–92; Michael R. Hall, *Sugar and Power in the Dominican Republic: Eisenhower, Kennedy, and the Trujillos* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000), 86–103; Richard E. Welch Jr., *Response to Revolution: The United States and the Cuban Revolution, 1959–1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 64–100; Karabell, *Architects of Intervention*, 62–135.

⁴³³Alonzo Hamby, *Man of the People: A Life of Harry Truman* (New York: Oxford, 1995), 398–401; Frank K. Kelly, *Harry Truman and the Human Family* (Santa Barbara, CA: Capra Press,

1950s for the Third World focused on economic development and national independence, even when other aspects of American aid supported conventional military operations. Eisenhower was taken, notably, by the poverty he saw in what is now called the Third World. He believed it was imperative, from both a moral and global strategic perspective, that relief be brought to remote rural villages that did not have schools, clean running water, electricity, or access to modern medicine. Without such aid, he believed that communism would sweep through those areas of the world. In doing so, the communists would render moot the larger questions of containment that involved nuclear weapons and force deployments in Europe. Both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations pursued the expansion of international law and international institutions devoted to global development, decolonization, and democracy.⁴³⁴ Their Wilsonianism, however, like that of all Cold War presidencies, was tempered by equally prolific support of a revolution in weaponry and the development of military forces everywhere in the “free world,” in addition to extensive political and economic support for the most repressive anticommunist regimes. As noted, it was Eisenhower who honored the leader of the CIA-sponsored coup against the democratic government of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala in 1954, and who also honored Ngo Dinh Diem, the CIA-installed dictator of the “Republic” of Vietnam. It was Harry Truman and Dean Acheson who supported the authoritarian South Korean government in its fight for survival during the Korean War. It was also Harry Truman’s administration that let tens of thousands of Nazis escape after the Second World War in exchange for their information on communist movements in Eastern Europe as well as use of their various scientific and military skills.⁴³⁵

1998); Steve Neal, Harry and Ike: The Partnership That Remade the Postwar World (New York: Scribner, 2001), 83–84; Robert R. Bowie, Waging Peace: How Eisenhower Shaped an Enduring Cold War Strategy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 251–56; Caroline Pruden, Conditional Partners: Eisenhower, the United Nations, and the Search for a Permanent Peace (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998), 16–36.

⁴³⁴William Adams Brown Jr., American Foreign Assistance (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1953); Howard S. Ellis, The Economics of Freedom: The Progress and Future of Aid to Europe (New York: Harper, 1950); Sergei Y. Shenin, The United States and the Third World: The Origins of the Postwar Relations and the Point Four Program (1949–1953) (Commack, NY: Nova Science, 2000); Burton I. Kaufman, Trade and Aid: Eisenhower’s Foreign Economic Policy, 1953–1961 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1982); Chester J. Pach Jr., The Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1991); Walter Krause, Economic Development: The Underdeveloped World and the American Interest (San Francisco: Wadsworth, 1961).

⁴³⁵Immerman, The CIA in Guatemala, 180; Cook, The Declassified Eisenhower, 286; William Conrad Gibbons, The U.S. Government and the Vietnam War: Executive and Legislative Roles and Relationships, 4 vols. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986–1994), 1:89; Linda Hunt, Secret Agenda: The United States Government, Nazi Scientists, and Project Paperclip, 1945 to 1990 (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991), 94–156; Christopher Simpson, Blowback: America’s Recruitment of Nazis and Its Effects on the Cold War (New York: Collier Books, 1989), 176–216.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Beyond the views of the military realist, who understood international relations in strategic terms, and beyond the diplomatic perspectives of neo-Wilsonianism and political realism, the postwar national security regime created a fully independent technocratic perspective on world affairs. This intellectual modality, which has been discussed in relation to technocratic knowledge and the technocratic state, was required for the management of complex foreign policy. The technocratic script, imparted to all those responsible for the management of foreign policy, effected the coordination of the spectrum of political, military, economic, and moral interests within the institutions of the executive branch. This perspective or mode of understanding I have described as managerial or technocratic internationalism. Distinct from particular military or diplomatic foreign policy perspectives, the managerial ideology carried the managerial script for American foreign policy and, hence, the nation's script for its relations to the world. As we have seen, its fundamental origins were in response to the institutionalization of a proactive role for the United States in the international system.

What had begun to emerge during the world wars and interwar period (1914–1945) as a technocratic ideology for international relations matured during the first phase of the Cold War into a coherent mode of understanding. The orthodox script developed both the concept and the physical reality of the national security establishment. The new institutional reality of the international Cold War affected the development of ideologies connected to the roles and knowledge (or epistemologies) for the national security system. By the early postwar period, four modes of understanding war, peace, international development, and human rights served as conceptual frameworks for American statecraft. They were the intellectual filters that statesmen, analysts, polemicists, legislators, soldiers, and admirals applied in their respective scripted consciousnesses and behaviors for the management of American foreign policy.⁴³⁶

Each mode, or ideology, allowed its adopter to view the world with a particular cognitive and affective content. These modalities were not mutually exclusive. In practice, the human mind, fully capable of dealing with dichotomies, paradoxes, contradictions, and anomalies, uses a repertoire of perspectives to interpret and explain complex phenomena. In most Americans involved in foreign affairs during the Cold War, there existed a political realist, a Wilsonian, a technocrat, and a soldier or “military realist.” In Harry Truman, for example, the soldier had no problem ordering the use of force. With some admonition to protect human life, he approved the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Without a great deal of agony, he accepted the military arguments for subjecting two Japanese cities to the superweapon. Yet, simultaneously, the Truman who approved total war against the enemy was also gravely concerned with the reconstruction of Japan as a democratic society. Using another mode of understanding, Truman's reconstruction policy toward both Japan and Germany focused not upon the military aspects of deterring their future aggression, but upon the development of nation-states that would abide by the rule of law and respect the constitutionally defined rights of their citizens. The spirit of Wilsonianism, itself a

⁴³⁶Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 13–14, 206–10.

product of American social science and the redemptive mission of American Protestantism, was Truman's guide to the managerial framework for American internationalism. Admittedly, Truman had little to do with policy development for support of the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, NATO, and his own Point Four programs to aid the Third World. Yet, in the end, he endorsed this new approach in American foreign relations.⁴³⁷

The managerial ideology found itself in the synthesis of interconnected military and political environments. It involved not only political and operational analysis but also included economic, strategic, psychological, and sociological factors within the overall assessment of foreign policy. We find the managerial mode of understanding most explicitly in planning documents. Military planning combined military realism with the technocratic, and political planning combined some form or combination of political realism/idealism with the technocratic; finally, the managerial mentality synthesized the elements of political, military, and technocratic (the quantitative disciplines) into a comprehensive and controlling ideology for foreign policy. President Truman was barely conscious of this new theoretical framework; he was a man of his time, from nineteenth-century rural Missouri. Nonetheless, the "national security discourse" realized itself in the bureaucratic analysis of the Pentagon and the analytical branches of the State Department and the intelligence service. With the passage of the legislation that established the postwar national security bureaucracy in the United States, war and war planning had now become a fully institutionalized, technocratic project for the management of the international system. NSC 68, famous as the blueprint for the containment program of the Truman and succeeding administrations, was essentially a planning document for a technocratic state. Military power, as the famous historical—almost iconic—document suggested, was connected directly to economic output, population size, and the political will to use force.⁴³⁸ With the emergence of a perceived aggressor in the Soviet Union, the discussions in the first months of 1950 revolved around the precise definition of the threat and the extent of America's response to it. The ambitious problems outlined in the text would be financed in a way reminiscent of America's total war mobilization in the 1940s. This time, however, contingency planning for a worldwide conventional war was complicated by the presence of the atomic bomb.⁴³⁹

⁴³⁷McCullough, Truman, 54–55, 453–61; Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, 174–79; Ninkovich, *The Wilsonian Century*, 145–82.

⁴³⁸Earnest May, ed., *American Cold War Strategy: Interpreting NSC 68* (New York: Bedford Books, 1993); Fordham, *Building the Cold War Consensus*; Paul Nitze, *From Hiroshima to Glasnost: At the Center of Decision: A Memoir* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1989), 82–116; Callahan, *Dangerous Capabilities*, 92–152.

⁴³⁹S. David Broscious, "Longing for International Control, Banking on American Superiority: Harry S. Truman's Approach to Nuclear Weapons," in John Gaddis, ed., *Cold War Statesmen Confront the Bomb: Nuclear Diplomacy since 1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 15–38.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

How much more complex and dangerous the world had become after Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The orthodox period of the Cold War required a massive national effort at war preparedness that would continue on indefinitely into the future. The neo-Wilsonian penchant for international law, the classic political realist view of diplomacy defined by the balance of power, and the Clausewitzian nationalism of the military's senior officer corps were now incorporated under the rubric of the managerial mode of perception and action. Managing the world through forward deployments of military forces and aggressive strategies for strategic alliance and economic and political development made the practice of global management coterminous with U.S. national security. Through decades of reiteration in planning and acculturation, the technocratic state would inculcate the idea of the new technocratic mission. Technocratic order had become the redemptive task for the nation-state.

Technocratic Knowledge

As we have seen, since the nineteenth century technocratic knowledge has followed an accelerated path of growth and differentiation. The decades prior to the First World War were very productive with respect to the creation of new disciplines for the development of bureaucratic and technical methods for the strategic assessment and management of the international system. Those emerging techniques were tested during the First World War and were refined during the interwar period and the Second World War. By the Second World War, the United States had highly developed systems in place for the technocratic management of the war, American society, and international relations. Indeed, the war had engendered a blossoming of knowledge related to the management of the international system. The war process had produced an explosion of fresh and creative knowledge with respect to postwar international planning. Initially under George Kennan, the containment theorist, diplomat, and later Cold War historian, the State Department's planning groups played a critical role in the postwar design of the international system. In the last years of the war and the first years of the postwar period, under Kennan's leadership, the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC) planned the postwar world along liberal technocratic lines. Kennan's immediate intellectual successors, including Paul Nitze and the whole group of analysts and officials brought together in 1949 and 1950, helped to produce the formal structure for postwar containment.⁴⁴⁰ The epistemologies for the Cold War ranged far and wide over the surface of the earth, constructing hoped-for scenarios for the progress of democracy and the rule of law, and the establishment of collective defense against communist attempts at subversion.

By necessity and by statutory law, the postwar American technocratic state developed technocratic knowledge. By statute, the new departments of State and Defense and the

⁴⁴⁰David Mayers, George Kennan and the Dilemmas of U.S. Foreign Policy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 86–188; Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 25–126, and *The United States and the End of the Cold War*, 18–46; Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, 110–14, 266–311; Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 371–401.

intelligence agencies of the late 1940s were required to evaluate American foreign policy using the full breadth of scientific and public policy resources available. The clear necessity was established by the series of events beginning in the mid- and late 1940s and continuing to the Korean War in the early 1950s that created a significant national consensus for a global national defense. An international system that was defined by containment became the purview of policy scientists. The liberal technocratic order, whose most influential agents inside of the American state were the famous “wise men” of American foreign policy, compelled the creation of an international political economy that understood the exigencies of development in both Europe and its colonial and postcolonial regions.⁴⁴¹

Leading national security figures, including the secretary of state, Dean Acheson; Paul Nitze, the author of NSC 68; Averill Harriman, the U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union; and, as noted above, George Kennan, previous Soviet ambassador and head of the policy planning department at State, saw the same problem. The critical basis for national survival in the postwar world required building liberal political economies that would engage in an ongoing flow of capital, goods, and labor and that would establish stable, increasingly productive, wealth-generating, efficient national economies committed to the survival of the “free world” as defined in the national security document. For liberalism to survive communism, as NSC 68 argued to Harry Truman, coordinated means were necessary to promote both collective defense and economic development throughout the containment perimeter and the underdeveloped world. At mid-century, the indices of national power and economic development were not very different from those used a hundred or more years earlier. The populations of the two opposing blocs, the Western alliance and the socialist camp, were divided fairly equally and represented in themselves a critical dimension of military and industrial strength. In addition to population, the more salient characteristics were the production of coal, steel, and rubber, not to mention wheat, corn, and other agricultural commodities. On the cusp of the nuclear age, nuclear weapons were not viewed as equal to the industrial characteristics of national strength.

The institutions and epistemologies of the American Cold War were thoroughly synchronous. The production of knowledge included the new policy science of national security studies. Nuclear war doctrines, such as Herman Kahn’s *On Thermonuclear War*, Henry Kissinger’s *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, and Bernard Brodie’s *Strategy in the Missile Age*, all were part of the new policy science for the new age. The militarization and globalization of the Cold War in the early 1950s mandated a profound binational exercise in the development of strategic force and programmed global economic and political influence. For policy institutes, namely, the Brookings Institution, and public policy consultants, such as the Rand Corporation, and major university centers

⁴⁴¹Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*, 315–418; Cumings, *The Roaring of the Cataract*, 35–180; Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, 312–60; Gaddis, *What We Now Know*, 1–112, and *Strategies of Containment*, 89–197.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

dedicated to national-security-related research, such as MIT, Harvard, Stanford, and Berkeley, the production of technocratic knowledge was a seamless exercise.⁴⁴²

The broad outlines of technocratic knowledge encompassed a huge tree of interconnected disciplines. The script called for the expansion of scientific and technical knowledge in all fields oriented toward the expression of global military power. Nuclear technology committed the two superpowers to a deadly serious arms race that within a little more than a decade had created weapons arsenals fully capable of ending human life on earth. Fission weapons were, by the Eisenhower administration, surpassed by thermonuclear fusion or “H” bombs, a thousand times more destructive. Bomber and artillery-based weapons developed during the Truman administration were augmented by the end of the Eisenhower years by ballistic missiles, either theater or the mid-range variety that the Soviets deployed in Cuba in 1962. The intercontinental types of doomsday assets that were placed in the American and Soviet heartlands of the 1960s were to be refined to become MIRVs in the 1970s. Finally, sea-based systems on submarines and the Strategic Defense Initiative of the 1980s were all logical developments from the orthodox script. The intellectual foundations for Armageddon were begun in the laboratories of the Second World War and were refined through the whole strategic culture of weapons-related nuclear physics in the United States and the Soviet Union. The impetus for the United States was to develop ballistic science, game theory, and the whole range of information technology and national security doctrines that two generations of graduate students and postgraduates learned at the elite institutions of the military and scientific establishment.⁴⁴³

⁴⁴²Brodie, *Strategy in the Missile Age*; Henry Kissinger, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* (New York: Harper, 1957); Herman Kahn, *On Thermonuclear War*. *There has been a recent flowering of the literature on this subject; however, literature on the history of major American think tanks, as of this writing, remains somewhat undeveloped. No major study has been done on the Rand Corporation or the Brookings Institution. For a general institutional history of the Brookings Institution, see James Allen Smith, Brookings at Seventy-five* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1991); Donald T. Critchlow, *The Brookings Institution, 1916–1952: Expertise and the Public Interest in a Democratic Society* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1985). *For general think-tank literature, see Leslie, The Cold War and American Science; David M. Ricci, The Transformation of American Politics: The New Washington and the Rise of Think Tanks* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993); Donald E. Abelson, *American Think-Tanks and Their Role in U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996); Diane Stone, *Capturing the Political Imagination: Think-Tanks and the Policy Process* (London: Frank Cass, 1996); Donald E. Abelson, *Do Think Tanks Matter? Assessing the Impact of Public Policy Institutes* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002).

⁴⁴³Scilla McLean, ed., *How Nuclear Weapons Decisions Are Made* (London: MacMillan 1986); Kahn, *On Thermonuclear War*, 453–576; Herman Kahn, *On Escalation: Metaphors and Scenarios* (New York: Praeger, 1965); Barry R. Posen, *Inadvertent Escalation: Conventional War and Nuclear Risks* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991); Stephen J. Cimbala, *NATO Strategy and Nuclear Escalation* (London: Pinter, 1989); Steven E. Miller, ed., *Strategy and Nuclear Deterrence: An International Security Reader* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984); Teresa Pelton Johnson and Steven E. Miller, eds., *Russian Security after the Cold War: Seven*

Sociologists and political scientists studied communist societies in comparative and historical perspectives. They, with historians and “area specialists,” developed detailed analyses of communist systems as they evolved through the postwar period. Economists studied communist and socialist economic systems, including the developing economies of the nascent postcolonial regimes of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. The comparative study of Western, non-Western, and socialist/communist societies supported the new containment doctrine and its evolving subdiscipline, known by the 1960s as “counterinsurgency” warfare. In the study of the developing countries and communist systems, societies were examined as both living, historical systems and as objects of study for technocratic development or what was known as “nation-building.” The new discipline included work on economic modernization in the developing world, techniques for propaganda, foreign intelligence, and other programs that were tools of the trade for national security intellectuals and administrators. In the last analysis, Cold War epistemology included all the technical and social science discourses related to the construction of containment.⁴⁴⁴

Containment doctrine was such a totalizing concept of control that it became almost synonymous with America’s relationship to the world. There were many cultural exchange programs during the 1950s, sponsored by public and private institutions. The programs included education, art, music, literary, scientific, commercial, and religious activities that engaged Americans with foreign peoples. These exchanges, like those of more formal government relations, were almost always framed within the context of containment ideology. America was always portrayed as a model for “emerging” or “new” independent countries around the world. Traditional culture, including dance, music, folk singing, and ceremonial art, was viewed as valued folk culture that needed to be protected in the process of modernization. Modernization could be capitalist and democratic, or it could be socialist or involve some form of modernity that was neither market-oriented nor communist.⁴⁴⁵

Views from Moscow (*Washington, DC: Brassey’s, 1994*); Sean M. Lynn-Jones, Steven E. Miller, and Stephen Van Evera, eds., *Soviet Military Policy: An International Security Reader* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989) and *Nuclear Diplomacy and Crisis Management: An International Security Reader* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990).

⁴⁴⁴Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968), 1–92; Cumings, *Parallax Visions*, 173–204; Allan A. Needell, “Project Troy and the Cold War Annexation of the Social Sciences,” in Simpson, *Universities and Empire*, 3–38; Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy*, 19–71.

⁴⁴⁵Frances Stonor Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters* (New York: Free Press, 2000); *United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs*, *A Beacon of Hope: The Exchange-of-Persons Program: A Report* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1963); Clarence W. Hunnicutt, ed., *America’s Emerging Role in Overseas Education* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University School of Education, 1962); Charles A. Thomson and Walter H. C. Laves, *Cultural Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Modernization theory had its antecedents in a century of social science. We saw the development of technocratic thought in the early twentieth century. Development, as understood by social scientists before and after the First World War, had to do with the approximation of Western society achieved by non-Western nations. Through the interwar period and the Second World War, development was seen as the process by which the backward or undeveloped achieved the technological and educational levels common to European societies. By the Cold War, a range of theories and methods had been developed in economics, sociology, anthropology, and political science to measure development. Development was viewed in historical terms, as Seymour Martin Lipset's *Political Man* exemplifies, but it was also viewed in terms of the new quantitative indices. By the 1960s, modernization had become a broad multidisciplinary concept for development studies that understood society's structures and functions historically, culturally, and, increasingly, through quantitative analysis.⁴⁴⁶

In its versatility and in its scripted dimension, modernization also became a strategic concept deemed vital for national security policy. Successful modernization, as opposed to "failed" modernization, was an essential goal of the containment regimes of successive American presidents. For a country to experience successful modernization, according to the orthodox context of the American Cold War, meant that it must grow, develop, and expand in all areas of political, economic, and social development, to mirror the institutions and culture of the West. According to its many critics from the later revisionist period, modernization was a hopelessly ethnocentric concept. Nonetheless, the modernization concept was used analytically as well as descriptively by social scientists, including economists, anthropologists, political scientists, and sociologists. It was a concept implicit in American foreign policy from the earliest years of the Cold War, and it continued as an operating principle long after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

The original concept of modernization was almost coterminous with democratic capitalism and Keynesian economics. Social scientists such as Walt Rostow, Daniel Lerner, David Apter, Samuel Huntington, Seymour Martin Lipset, A. F. Organski, and many others were all of the same generation and milieu.⁴⁴⁷ They habitually worked on government intelligence projects, served in the Second World War or after in military and/or civilian roles, and advised national security institutions on policies related to anticommunism. In the case of Walt Rostow, he wrote Kennedy's basic national security doctrine in 1962 and was Lyndon Johnson's second national security adviser. He was also the leading proponent of the Keynesian modernization approach to the developing

⁴⁴⁶Seymour Martin Lipset, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Books, 1960).

⁴⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 45–96; W. W. Rostow, *The Process of Economic Growth* (New York: Norton, 1952); David E. Apter, *Politics of Modernization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 1–80, 313–421; Daniel Lerner, *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East* (Glencoe, IL, Free Press, 1958), 43–75; A. F. Organski, *The Stages of Political Development* (New York: Knopf, 1965); Marion J. Levy, *Modernization and the Structure of Societies: A Setting for International Affairs* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969).

world. In Rostow's copious writings, underdevelopment was a problem of insufficient capitalization. With enough foreign aid, capital would coalesce in the impoverished hinterlands of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and the progressive expansion of the private sector would take off. Communism, a threat to every country everywhere, according to orthodox beliefs, would be thwarted by the capitalist-financed modernization of the entire Third World.⁴⁴⁸

For the two decades of the orthodox period and for some time afterward, the Keynesian modernization paradigm supported American foreign aid programs. Since public investment had clearly ended the depression and won the Second World War, and in the prosperous postwar era continued to extend the strength of liberal capitalism in the United States and also in Europe and East Asia, the normative script for American policy remained essentially unchanged. Truman, Eisenhower (with some qualification), Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and, to an extent, all American presidents until Ronald Reagan, saw the world in terms of a Keynesian program for modernization. Money transferred to the developing world could be used for schools, roads, hospitals, telecommunications, energy plants, agricultural assistance, and all manner of good works, to lay the foundations for modern liberal industrialized societies. Communism would be defeated, it seemed, almost like an exercise in common sense, by eliminating the "four horsemen of the apocalypse," as John F. Kennedy said in his inauguration, or establishing the "Four Freedoms," as Franklin Roosevelt stated as a corollary to the Atlantic Charter.

However, liberal internationalism in the Cold War context was also an intellectual framework that emphasized military aid to the largest degree, even superseding aid for economic infrastructure, public health, and education. Development, as understood in the orthodox context, married economic assistance with military aid. The orthodox script justified foreign aid as an instrument linked directly to American national security. Scholars have viewed early post-World War II American foreign policy as an exercise in the externalization of the New Deal. This analogy holds, but must include the massive structure for military preparedness. In the first decades of the Cold War, the military's view dominated American Cold War consciousness. The ubiquitous militarism in early Cold War thought suggested the strict budgetary preferences of a state largely controlled by military institutions and allied private interests. Technocratic knowledge, in this context, became an instrument for those institutions closest to control of the state. Militarized technocratic knowledge then competed with the Keynesian model for Third World development and for shaping the American state and its foreign policy script.⁴⁴⁹

⁴⁴⁸Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth*, 4–58.

⁴⁴⁹Richard Holt, *The Reluctant Superpower: A History of America's Global Economic Reach* (New York: Kodansha International, 1995); Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World: Political Development Ideas in Foreign Aid and Social Science* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973), 25–58; David A. Baldwin, *Economic Development and American Foreign Policy, 1943–62* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 243–72; Vernon W. Ruttan, *United States Development Assistance Policy: The Domestic Politics of Foreign Economic Aid* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 33–102.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The orthodox worldview skewed knowledge in the direction of technocracy, oriented toward the big science of the military. It was assumed that the entire world outside the United States was either under communist rule or was extremely vulnerable to its conquest or vassalage. This psychological climate quickly made the mandate for containment boundless. There were reasons, albeit not necessarily rational ones, for the country to deploy large contingents of its forces outside of North America. There were also reasons for developing ever larger, more destructive nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems. One could argue that it was precisely these reasons, articulated in technical monographs and developed by promilitary ideologues, that led to the orthodox period's end. The strategic expansionism vigorously advocated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the early 1960s, and reborn after the Vietnam War in the 1970s, called for a ground war in Vietnam. The script required the production of knowledge for the articulation of containment. In producing this knowledge, vast reservoirs of military and social scientific knowledge were created. Yet, when the intellectual framework supported what was politically insupportable, the framework's essential legitimacy collapsed.⁴⁵⁰

Orthodox Containment

Orthodox containment was bathed in the images of the Second World War. In the minds of the generation that supported containment's creation, the circumstances that led to the most significant American war since the Civil War became the imprimatur for the Cold War conflict. The intensity of emotional attachment and sense of danger felt in the construction of a global wall against communism reflected the particularly dark representation of Stalinism in Russia and Maoism in China and the threat they posed to human freedom. The collective sense of the betrayals by the Nazis at Munich and the Japanese at Pearl Harbor filled the memories of the generation that had experienced the war with its own eyes.

Necessarily, American orthodoxy viewed the world in terms of the old script for appeasement. The treacheries of the Nazis and the Japanese militarists who brutalized soldiers and civilians in a global war inspired mistrust and vengeance toward any foreign enemy. The Soviets, seen as logical replacements for Hitler, were enveloped in the shroud of McCarthyist postwar fear and anger. Indeed, the fear that the Soviets produced in Americans was profound.⁴⁵¹ There were suspicions that the Soviets had penetrated every aspect of American society. Communists were suspected to be in every corner of American life, quietly waiting for orders from the Kremlin. The depth of fear of domestic subversion extended very readily to the nuclear Cold War. It was assumed by many military analysts that the Soviets would use nuclear weapons at the earliest opportunity to

⁴⁵⁰Few observers or participants were in a better position to witness the collapse of orthodox containment than Henry Kissinger. Kissinger, *White House Years, 1953–1961*, and *Years of Upheaval* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1982), 302–73; Thornton, *The Nixon-Kissinger Years*, 3–45.

⁴⁵¹Trow, *Right-Wing Radicalism and Political Intolerance*, 60–84; Fried, *Nightmare in Red*, 144–70; Heale, *McCarthy's Americans*, 214–76; Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes*, 119–200; Rose, *One Nation Underground*, 38–77; Rose, *The Cold War Comes to Main Street*, 64–165.

win a nuclear war against the United States. There was no inconsistency in Lyndon Johnson thoughts when, despite misgivings over the Vietnam War, despite massive reservations, he remained resolute in his decision not to appease the enemy and to place his entire presidential legacy at risk, for to give up on Vietnam would have fulfilled the deepest fear of the Pearl Harbor generation.⁴⁵²

The potential for a global war was a condition of life for Americans in the mid-twentieth century. The culture and political discourse of the period reflected a distinct manly desire to preempt any attack by any adversary. There was not going to be another Pearl Harbor or a return to the appeasement of the Axis powers prior to the Second World War. In a militarized world, which the early Cold War world certainly was, the environment of foreign affairs, if not everyday life, inspired a very masculine tone in popular culture. GI crew cuts were popular in the 1950s, as were movies and personalities that typified the toughness of a man. A whole generation of war veterans understood power and manhood in American life in military terms. To compound matters, the nature of war in the nuclear age cast doubt on the very possibility of a future world. It was entirely possible, and Americans of this period weighed it on a daily basis, that contemporary everyday life would soon end in the fire of a nuclear holocaust. Hence, the orthodox script was tough, suspicious, potentially belligerent, and expansive toward the world and the perceived communist threat.⁴⁵³

Remarkably, despite the apocalyptic predictions of nuclear conflict and the deep sense of permanent war status that permeated foreign policy ideology, the national culture and the domestic life of the country remained vibrant and industrious. Suburban homes and large families were the norm, even with the country flirting with war and building bomb shelters. Despite the dire potential of thermonuclear conflagration and the deep paranoia imparted by McCarthy, there remained traditional energy and optimism in American life. The society dealt, albeit imperfectly, with the great domestic issues of race and poverty that affected mid-twentieth-century America. Race had long simmered in American politics as the country industrialized and matured. Then in the orthodox period of the Cold War, the modern civil rights movement was born in the wake of the liberal Warren court's decisions of the mid-1950s. The technocratic society that had prided itself not only on its scientific and technical achievements but on its commitment to democracy was challenged by its inherent and shameful contradictions on the civil rights of nonwhites. In this matter the script for the orthodox Cold War was deeply threatened. It would not long stand an assault from a mass protest movement that embarrassed the

⁴⁵²Beschloss, *Reaching for Glory*, 181–82.

⁴⁵³Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1996), 1–51, 101–26; Ronnie D. Lipschutz, *Cold War Fantasies: Film, Fiction, and Foreign Policy* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001); M. Keith Booker, *The Post-utopian Imagination: American Culture in the Long 1950s* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002), 101–41; Timothy Melley, *Empire of Conspiracy: The Culture of Paranoia in Postwar America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 1–45.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

country internationally, giving the Soviets the upper hand in the critical war for world public opinion.⁴⁵⁴

The American narrative for the Cold War was chastened by the growth of Soviet military power and the rise of Chinese communism as an independent threat all over Asia. American foreign policy feared the strategic threat posed by the Soviet rocket forces and conventional armies but also maintained an agenda for global and regional political economy. According to some American social scientists and national security analysts in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the economic components of containment would support the long-term viability of the entire containment system. The policy in question was the Marshall Plan, an ambitious attempt to restore the devastated nations of Central and Western Europe to prewar functional status. It would need to bring stable and prosperous economic conditions to a continent that had traumatized two generations with two horrific wars. For the Germans, the Marshall Plan was a means of rebuilding what had been utterly destroyed by the Allies in their war against Hitlerism. In France, the Marshall Plan was another way for the United States to assert its power and prestige in Europe. The Marshall Plan was formed less than two years after the war had ended. Its broad and imposing purpose was to finance the reconstruction of Western Europe—to bring back to Europe the development it had lost because of the destruction of the war. Congress supported the plan based upon the simple premise that rebuilding France and Germany and financing Great Britain, among other countries, was considered a vital interest of the United States. Marshall Plan aid to the recovering countries would be a very effective means of supporting the postwar free world. In postwar Europe and the vast areas of the Third World associated with Europe, the Marshall aid program represented a generous but necessary adjunct to the national security means applied by the United States. In the end, NATO and the entire framework for postwar industrial prosperity were tied to the success of the plan.⁴⁵⁵

The Marshall Plan

To preserve the balance of power in Europe, the United States moved aggressively in the late 1940s to provide the food, fuel, and finance capital necessary to ensure the rebuilding of Western Europe. The nature of the objective was obvious, and it garnered wide support in the United States. The instrument of postwar reconstruction in Europe was the Marshall Plan, which supplied that needed American capital to rebuild the

⁴⁵⁴Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 85–137; Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 79–151.

⁴⁵⁵Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 26–53; Martin Schain, ed., *The Marshall Plan: Fifty Years After* (New York: Palgrave, 2000); Gregory A. Fossedal, *Our Finest Hour: Will Clayton, the Marshall Plan, and the Triumph of Democracy* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1993); Charles Kindleberger, *Marshall Plan Days* (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987); Alan Milward, *The Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1945–1951* (London: Methuen, 1984), 1–55, 421–61.

shattered economic systems of the great European powers. The liberal technocratic order required the integration of Europe and Japan to sustain a credible deterrent against the rival socialist system. The Europeans understood the need for American aid in significant quantities if the continent were to make a full and quick recovery from the massive destruction of the war. Given the perceived exigencies of the Stalinist threat to Western Europe, the plan named after General George C. Marshall had little trouble finding congressional support.⁴⁵⁶

Over six years, principally 1947 through 1952, the Marshall Plan funneled money to restore the national and regional economies of those parts of Europe under the auspices of the United States and its allies. The reconstruction aid supported the technocratic modernization of Western Europe. In doing so, it combined the Wilsonian idea of humanitarian and technical assistance to war-ravaged countries and the corporatist or managerial internationalism of the private sector. The political coalition that underlay Roosevelt's foreign policy from the late 1930s onward served this part of the national script. The narrative for the Marshall Plan combined the political goals of major economic actors, labor unions, and multinational corporations. For both American labor unions and the highly capitalized brokerage firms, banks, and oil companies that favored the multilateralism of Roosevelt's liberal internationalist foreign policy, the Marshall Plan scripted a revitalized pro-American postwar Western Europe. The domestic coalition of disparate groups was made possible by a confluence of political and economic interests in postwar corporate/technocratic internationalism. Its intellectual premise was that a form of New Deal internationalism was not a weak alternative to a strong nationalist military policy. Rather, the multilateral stabilization and reconstruction program was considered the means for achieving a fundamental national interest in the development of democratic market-oriented countries in Western Europe.⁴⁵⁷

By the early 1950s, the Marshall Plan had achieved its objectives. Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway had all recovered from the fundamental destructive effects of the war. Despite the growth of social democratic politics in postwar Western Europe, the essential open trading system had survived the cataclysm of the war. Large multinational corporations, which operated throughout Europe and indeed on every continent, were preserved as autonomous economic institutions. In this way, capitalism remained at the center of the liberal technocratic order rather than state institutions. The Marshall Plan served the strategic plan of the United States in providing the political and economic basis for the NATO

⁴⁵⁶Forrest Pogue, *George C. Marshall, Statesman, 1945–1959* (New York: Viking, 1987), 237–57; Fossedal, *Our Finest Hour*, 235–80.

⁴⁵⁷Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 135–88; Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*, 69–118; Thomas Ferguson, *Golden Rule: The Investment Theory of Party Competition and the Logic of Money-Driven Political Systems* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 113–72; Ove Bjarnar and Matthias Kipping, “The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of U.S. Management Models to Europe,” in Matthias Kipping and Ove Bjarnar, eds., *The Americanization of European Business: The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of U.S. Management Models* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 1–17.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

alliance and the integrated international market for American exports. By the 1960s, the tripartite containment system that connected North America, Europe, and the Pacific Rim centered upon Japan, created an extraordinarily powerful global alliance against the intrigues of either Soviet or Chinese communism.

Strategic Orthodoxy

Fundamentally, the orthodox script required the bringing together of military systems and business systems. The defense of the liberal order, resplendent in its impressive growth and differentiation throughout the world, still required the comprehensive integration of the technocratic model. The strategic dimensions of global technocracy required the deliberate building of policies linked inextricably to both the politics and economic conditions of the core countries. In Europe, complementing the Marshall Plan's political economy was the strategic system of NATO. In Southeast Asia, in the wake of the collapse of French Indochina, the United States sponsored a parallel system in the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO). Other defense alliances included ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand, and the United States), the Central Asian Treaty Organization (CENTO), and the Rio pact that included most of Latin America and the United States in a collective defense treaty. These multilateral treaties were also reinforced by bilateral pacts. The United States had mutual defense arrangements with Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, among other countries, as well as presidential commitments to South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. This enormous global web of containment institutions comprised the orthodox period's system of collective defense. In the Soviet camp, the Warsaw Pact mobilized the Soviet Union and its Eastern European allies, while bilateral treaties, including the Sino-Soviet defense pact of 1950, extended Soviet commitments and military power around the world.⁴⁵⁸

Strategic orthodoxy required the building of international strategic forces for the contingency of global or "general" war. NATO was at the heart of American strategic thinking throughout the Cold War. The long-standing view of Atlantic- or European-oriented thinkers in the State Department and elsewhere was that no holds should be

⁴⁵⁸Martin A. Smith, *NATO in the First Decade after the Cold War* (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000); Lawrence S. Kaplan, *The United States and NATO: The Formative Years* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1984), 93–144; Francis H. Heller and John R. Gillingham, eds., *NATO: The Founding of the Atlantic Alliance and the Integration of Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992); Gustav Schmidt, ed., *A History of NATO: The First Fifty Years*, 3 vols. (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 2:305–57; William Park, *Defending the West: A History of NATO* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986), 3–62; Don Cook, *Forging the Alliance: NATO, 1945–1950* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1989); Leszek Buszynski, *SEATO: The Failure of an Alliance Strategy* (Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1983), 44–71; Magnus Persson, *Great Britain, the United States, and the Security of the Middle East: The Formation of the Baghdad Pact* (Lund, Sweden: Lund University Press, 1998), 240–304; Thomas-Durell Young, *Australian, New Zealand, and United States Security Relations, 1951–1986* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992), 17–56; W. David McIntyre, *Background to the Anzus Pact: Policy-Making, Strategy, and Diplomacy, 1945–55* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 66–118.

barred to maintain control of Germany and the rest of noncommunist Europe. To even suggest that the United States recognized Soviet interests in Western Europe meant to the national security establishment of the Cold War that the United States had in effect surrendered to the enemy. It was simply inconceivable to strategic analysts and statesmen that either side in the Cold War would lose or downgrade its position on the European continent. This was what made Berlin so critical an issue in the first decades of the Cold War. During the Cuban Missile Crisis, it became apparent that the American side viewed the Soviet gambit in Cuba as just that. The issues, as far as every member of the executive committee of the U.S. National Security Council was concerned, were the Soviets' worldwide intentions in the Cold War. Specifically, whether an attack on Cuba would result in a counterattack on Berlin, the vortex of the East-West conflict in Europe.⁴⁵⁹

The technocratic state supported the strategic architecture of containment with the institutional coordination of policy. Through the dozens of treaties and formal assistance plans that were part of its foreign policy portfolio, the national security structure designed a global system of command and control. Technocratic management of the Cold War required the global integration of all aspects of the containment policy, from nuclear arms to conventional deterrence, counterinsurgency, and the modernization programs targeted at the Third World. The issues that affected American foreign policy were under constant review and subject to immediate policy change. Consequently, the coordination of information from the White House down through the channels in the State Department, the Department of Defense, and the CIA remained a critical issue for the bureaucracy. The needs of the containment system changed with international conditions, and it was critical that the institutional machinery respond. A host of related activities needed to be coordinated through the domestic political system of the United States, the realm of diplomacy, and the domestic environments of allies and other countries. The efficacy of this process varied greatly from country to country. For example, the Guatemalan coup of 1954 was sold effectively to the American public, while Latin American public opinion viewed it as yet another example of Yankee imperialism and the tragedy it entailed.

Despite the construction of global containment and the emphasis on national defense, Eisenhower resisted efforts to enlarge the defense budget, which was at 10 percent of gross national product during most of the 1950s. Eisenhower's fiscal conservatism rejected an unlimited commitment of national resources to the Pentagon. The literature on Eisenhower suggests that his administration tried to "rationalize" the uncoordinated and clumsy Truman containment policy. Eisenhower defended the Pacific Rim not primarily with combat troops, as Truman and his successor Kennedy did, but with his nuclear deterrent. He refused to commit troops to Indochina in 1954 and did not appreciably expand ground force deployments in any of the world's other regions critical for containment. American troops were only briefly sent to the Middle East during the

⁴⁵⁹Adam Ulam, "Khrushchev's Grand Design," in Robert A. Divine, ed., *The Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: Marcus Weiner, 1988), 135–48; Zelikow and May, *The Kennedy Tapes*, 34, 61, 90, 115.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Lebanon crisis of 1958. In Latin America, Eisenhower did not send troops to oust Castro in 1960. He did not deploy troops to Africa as independence beckoned. Only in the European sphere did Eisenhower commit substantial ground forces, as well as naval and air units. The broad treaty commitments that his secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, negotiated around the world were implicitly commitments the United States backed with its ever-growing nuclear deterrent. Eisenhower did not use his nuclear arsenal, nor apparently did he come as close as Kennedy to nuclear war, but his “massive response” strategy, a variation on classic Clausewitzian warfare doctrine, supported the eventual use of such weapons in a general war.⁴⁶⁰

As a soldier, Eisenhower naturally viewed the international system in terms of the strategic dimensions of power. Wherever technocratic science led military scientists was acceptable, provided that the results translated into effective deterrence for the preservation of the balance of power and the integrity of the nation-state. Thermonuclear devices capable of destroying entire conventional armies in a matter of seconds were the deterrents of choice for any military leader in the orthodox era. To maximize power, Eisenhower funded billion-dollar research and development programs on the production of nuclear weapons and the delivery of the required command and control systems. Popular culture romanticized the space age. Science writers in the 1950s suggested the possibility of colonizing Mars and Venus and building space colonies all over the solar system. Naturally, however, as news films showed the massive explosions of H-bombs, public consciousness filled with terror at the onset of the nuclear age. Yet the space age and the nuclear age were intimately related.⁴⁶¹ For the purposes of manned space flight and the exploration of the solar system, popular perception was of secondary importance. Space exploration was a function of the rocket science and national security imperatives for nuclear war. Eisenhower and all of his successors understood this, as the technocratic institutions of the Cold War built the first systems that expanded the human domain outside the earth’s atmosphere.

⁴⁶⁰Bowie, *Waging Peace*, 189; Saki Dockrill, *Eisenhower’s New-Look National Security Policy, 1953–61* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996), 65–71; John Burke, *How Presidents Test Reality: Decisions on Vietnam 1954 and 1965* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1989), 28–115; Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990); Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 127–63.

⁴⁶¹Tom D. Crouch, *Aiming for the Stars: The Dreamers and Doers of the Space Age* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1999); James H. Straubel, ed., *Space Weapons: A Handbook of Military Astronautics* (New York: Praeger, 1959); Simon Ramo, ed., *Peacetime Uses of Outer Space* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961); Willy Ley, ed., *Harnessing Space* (New York: Macmillan, 1963); U.S. Senate, *Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences*, *United States International Space Programs: Texts of Executive Agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, and Other International Arrangements, 1959–1965; staff report* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1965).

Technocratic Science

A major arena of the orthodox Cold War was born in 1957. The first manmade object, no more than four feet in length, circled the earth. Sputnik shocked the American public and the Eisenhower administration. The ability of the Soviets to show their technical superiority in the critical field of aeronautical engineering mortified a country that feared that it was surrounded in the world by subversive revolutionary forces and that there remained the danger of military conquests by the communists and their leftist allies. Perhaps in the long run the most important pillar of the technocratic blueprint for the Cold War was found in the enormous and successful effort devoted to the exploration of near space. In the scientific projects required for the first generation of manned and unmanned space exploration, the satellites and the space rockets demonstrated not only the depth of competition between the Soviet Union and the United States, but the essential nature of the East-West conflict. The 1957 Sputnik launch was vastly more important for its impact upon the relative prestige of the Soviet Union and the United States than for the practical value of sending such objects into space. Its immediate legacy in the United States was a general reexamination of the military and civilian institutions and their comparative readiness to meet the perceived Soviet threat.⁴⁶²

Clearly, the beginning of the space age was a critical and important element in the development of the postwar technocratic script. The program to explore outer space propelled scientific and quantitative forms of knowledge to a vastly greater level of importance. The simple launching into near-earth orbit of a hundred-pound, four-foot metal object with a radio transmitter was to reorient the United States toward the exigencies of the technocratic nuclear age. It was Sputnik, with its intimations of American national inferiority in intellectual disciplines, that touched off a concerted frenzy to expand science education in the United States. The script called for the supremacy of the United States vis-à-vis all of its potential adversaries. Supremacy was upheld, not by greatly improving American education, but through the comparative advantages of American science and industry over their Soviet counterparts. Science education was geared toward the elites who sent their children to college to learn astrophysics and engineering. The average American student, even with the enrichment of his or her curriculum provided by the new education money, was not motivated to become a particle physicist or an aerospace engineer. What did happen was a technocratic response by the state and the corporate sector to continue and accelerate the scientific programs born during the Cold War.⁴⁶³

⁴⁶²Divine, *The Sputnik Challenge*, 157–84; Paul Dickson, *Sputnik: The Shock of the Century* (New York: Walker, 2001), 108–33; David L. Snead, *The Gaither Committee, Eisenhower, and the Cold War* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1999), 129–95.

⁴⁶³Barbara Barksdale Clowse, *Brainpower for the Cold War: The Sputnik Crisis and National Defense Education Act of 1958* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981); Hugh Davis Graham and Nancy Diamond, *The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 1–50; Simpson, *Universities and*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

In the long run, despite Kennedy's campaign rhetoric in 1960, the Russians were expected to lose. A powerful nation-state could not survive without a coherent economic strategy. There was no substantive reality to the statement by Nikita Khrushchev in 1960, "We will bury you." The Soviet Union could not bury the United States if it could not take care of itself.⁴⁶⁴

Crises in the Orthodox Period

From an institutional perspective, the orthodox script involved the impressive development of technocratic knowledge and institutions. Beyond that level of analysis, there were also the crises of the orthodox period. The recurring crises, proxy wars, and superpower confrontations were the dramas that established the political boundaries, collective memories, and meanings for the orthodox period. Certainly, what focused the Cold War in all its periods were the various international crises. They tested the resolve of the crisis participants in light of the potential for danger and, most darkly, nuclear apocalypse. The crises were legion: Berlin in 1948–1949, the Korean War in 1950, the Taiwan Straits in the mid-1950s, Hungary and Suez in 1956, Berlin again in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Indochina in the early and mid-1950s and then again in the 1960s. Finally, the most deadly crisis of all was Cuba in October 1962. All were elaborate and very serious but nonetheless scripted dramas. The actors—namely, nation-states, national leaders, their advisers, the international media, and the mass publics of national and international opinion—engaged in often intense and focused examinations of perceptions and threats. With each momentous and quite often dangerous script, the actors reinforced their respective worldviews but often learned some critical information about the other side that would eventually move the orthodox metascript to resolution.⁴⁶⁵

Empire; Allen A. Nydell, *Science, Cold War and the American State*; Lloyd V. Berkner and the Balance of Professional Ideals (*Amsterdam: Marston, 2000*).

⁴⁶⁴Paul R. Gregory, *Russian and Soviet Economic Structure and Performance* (*Boston: Addison-Wesley, 2001*); Abram Bergson, *Planning and Performance in Socialist Economies: The USSR and Eastern Europe* (*Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989*); Robert W. Campbell, *The Failure of Soviet Economic Planning: System, Performance, Reform* (*Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992*); Gerald K. Haines and Robert E. Leggett, eds., *CIA's Analysis of the Soviet Union, 1947–1991: A Documentary Collection* (*Washington, DC: CIA, 2001*).

⁴⁶⁵Richard K. Betts, *Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises* (*New York: Columbia University Press, 1991*); Richard J. Aldrich, Gary D. Rawnsley, and Ming-Yeh T. Rawns, eds., *The Clandestine Cold War in Asia, 1945–65: Western Intelligence, Propaganda and Special Operations* (*London: Frank Cass, 2000*); Raymond Tanter, *Modelling and Managing International Conflicts: The Berlin Crises* (*Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1974*); Robert Jervis, *The Logic of Images in International Relations* (*Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970*) and *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (*Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976*); Robert Jervis, ed., *Psychology and Deterrence* (*Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985*); Richard Ned Lebow, *Between War and Peace: The Nature of International Crisis* (*Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981*).

By resolution, I mean the transition of the script to the next stage. The terms of the conflict changed because the orthodox script lost its legitimacy. The revisionist script defined the new tone of the Cold War. In the revisionist period, the meaning of the global conflict was no longer explicit but subject to critical examination and intellectual ambiguity. Orthodox ideology and institutional structures remained, but the script had changed. As we shall see, a number of events in the early 1960s forced the change. The experience of the Cuban Missile Crisis and the seeming illogic of the early intervention period in Vietnam, combined with the Sino-Soviet split and the signing of the strategic test ban treaty, were the nexus of events that ended the rationale for the orthodox script. American intervention in Vietnam was the final stroke. When, on the floor of the senate in 1965, U.S. senators debated America's intervention in Vietnam, the orthodox period had moved to closure. Finally, after the anti-Vietnam War movement gained critical mass within the American public and in the U.S. Congress, the orthodox period of the Cold War was truly over.⁴⁶⁶

The East Asian Crises: Korea

The orthodox script did two things extremely well. First, it reoriented American society toward the political and social conformity it demanded. This was accomplished through the McCarthyist practices of the late 1940s and early 1950s. Even with McCarthy's censure and departure from politics, the domestic arrangements for imposing legal, institutional, and cultural controls continued through other means. Second, the programmatic actions of all the presidential administrations during the orthodox period built and stabilized the containment system, using economic expertise and capital funding, intelligence and covert operations, and the military strength of an expanding armed forces to support U.S. strategic interests. Nonetheless, but as one could expect, the orthodox script struggled with crises everywhere in the world. In Europe and in East Asia in particular, crises were related to the development and stabilization of the containment system.⁴⁶⁷

The Korean War was the definitive crisis of the Truman presidency, effectively ending Harry Truman's political career by precluding a second term. The Berlin Crisis of 1948–1949 challenged American and British resolve to control Germany in the postwar period. Resisting Stalin's move against Berlin was not a politically hard decision. Clearly, all sectors of American and British public opinion, with outlying exceptions, viewed Berlin and Germany as a vital interest of the free world. Earlier crises involving Greece and Turkey and the stabilization of France and Italy, in the immediate postwar

⁴⁶⁶*Schwab, Defending the Free World, 204–10; DeBenedetti and Chatfield, An American Ordeal; William C. Berman, William J. Fulbright and the Vietnam War: The Dissent of a Political Realist (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1988); Chomsky, American Power and the New Mandarins; David Farber, Chicago '68 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); James J. Farrell, The Spirit of the Sixties: Making Postwar Radicalism (New York: Routledge, 1997).*

⁴⁶⁷*Leffler, Preponderance of Power, 312–60; Offner, Another Such Victory: President Truman and the Cold War, 1945–1953 (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002), 185–244.*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

period, were also of comparatively little divisiveness. The point in the Truman presidency that tested the orthodox script for the redeemer nation was the surprise invasion of South Korea across the forty-seventh parallel by the North Korean army in June 1950.⁴⁶⁸

Prior to the attack by communist forces, South Korea was not assessed as a vital strategic interest of the United States. The Joint Chiefs of Staff had made this assessment since the late 1940s in their reports to the defense community and the White House. From a military perspective, U.S. strategic interests in the support of the American defense perimeter in East Asia did not include the Korean peninsula. South Korea simply was not a critical area that merited the deployment of large-scale forces. The American and British press, including the *New York Times*, interpreted Dean Acheson's views as consistent with the military assessment. In speeches given in January and February 1950, in effect detailing the architecture of national security in NSC 68, the public was given the erroneous perception that the Republic of Korea was not a vital interest of the United States. In the technocratic organization of American foreign policy for East Asia, the Asian "rim," from Japan down through the Philippines, Taiwan, Indonesia, and French Indochina, was a vital interest. Overall, the rim was one cohesive economic and political unit. Building the rim would contain the core, which now, as of October 1949 and the Chinese revolution, was under communist domination.⁴⁶⁹

This cold strategic calculation, however, missed the public significance of a communist army overrunning a small outpost in the free world. The Cold War's orthodox script had adapted the heroic narrative of the Second World War. As the North Korean army drove the hapless South Korean defense forces south toward the end of their peninsula, Truman and Acheson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff quickly moved to block a communist victory. Korea was instantly identified as a vital interest and outpost of freedom. MacArthur landed his army at Inchon and quickly cut off the supply lines to the aggressive communist army laying siege to Korean and American forces fighting desperately to defend the small remaining enclave that they controlled in the southeast portion of country. MacArthur's brilliant strategy forced the North Korean army's collapse and hasty retreat north above the thirty-eighth parallel. By October 1950, MacArthur's army was driving the communists to the Chinese frontier. It was then that MacArthur and the Truman administration parted company.

⁴⁶⁸Cumings, *The Roaring of the Cataract*, 545–631; Richard C. Thornton, *Odd Man Out: Truman, Stalin, Mao, and the Origin of the Korean War* (Washington, DC: Brassey's, 2000), 185–246; Brian Catchpole, *The Korean War* (New York: Carroll & Graff, 2000), 3–17; Patrick C. Roe, *The Dragon Strikes: China and the Korean War, June–December 1950* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 2000); *Korean Institute of Military History, The Korean War*, 3 vols. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000–2001), 1:156–218; William Stueck, *The Korean War: An International History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), 31–61; Offner, *Another Such Victory*, 34–80.

⁴⁶⁹Cumings, *The Roaring of the Cataract*, 58–65, 408–38; Stueck, *The Korean War*, 42–44; Sergei N. Goncharov, John W. Lewis, and Xue Litai, *Uncertain Partners: Stalin, Mao, and the Korean War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), 130–67

MacArthur, as Korean War historiography relates, wanted to “roll back” the communists by having the authority to pursue them into North Korea, irrespective of communist Chinese or Soviet actions and perceptions of American strategy. To counter any threat from China, he wanted the authority to use tactical nuclear weapons along the Chinese frontier. MacArthur’s presumptive strategy was thoroughly Clausewitzian. He wanted to maintain the initiative and to execute a war strategy that would not only damage the enemy but seek its annihilation. The strategy of total war was nothing new. It was the same type of war that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had pursued during the Second World War, the same strategy that Hitler’s Wehrmacht had used on two fronts, and what the Red Army and the British bomber command had pursued in their attacks on the Reich. Total war in the twentieth century, according to the precepts of strategic or military or Clausewitzian realism, was the preferred orientation not only of Douglas MacArthur but of most military officers in the U.S. armed forces in the first two decades of the Cold War. Even after Vietnam and after the Cold War, the “Powell doctrine” that guided the 1991 Gulf War was the use of overwhelming force against an enemy to achieve particular political objectives. MacArthur followed his military script right up to the Yalu River, and then, without the nuclear weapons he wanted, he was thrown back across the thirty-eighth parallel by a massive force of Chinese troops.⁴⁷⁰

Ultimately, the general was relieved of his command by the internationalists, who quite rightly saw danger of a third world war in the right-wing nationalist approach of their celebrated war hero. Matthew Ridgeway assumed command of United Nations forces on the peninsula and through equally brilliant leadership stabilized the ugly war near the dividing line of the two postwar occupation zones. Truman and Acheson held the line there with their allies, negotiating relentlessly for two years with the communists to achieve a settlement. It took the threat of nuclear weapons by the Eisenhower administration to finally bring the Korean War to a permanent armistice. The war ended in the first months of the new administration, and the 1954 Geneva conference, which also resolved, at least temporarily, the Indochina conflict, ratified its settlement.⁴⁷¹

Soviet and Chinese Scripts

The Soviet and Chinese scripts vis-à-vis the Korean War connected to the United States only in the context of the capitalist adversary defending its Pacific defense perimeter. Archival evidence shows that both Stalin and Mao approved of the North Korean attack on South Korea in June 1950.⁴⁷² Both communist powers feared the North

⁴⁷⁰Roe, *The Dragon Strikes*, 141–225; Stueck, *The Korean War*, 85–166; Goncharov, Lewis, and Litai, *Uncertain Partners*, 168–202.

⁴⁷¹Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 461–77; Stueck, *The Korean War*, 308–70; Kathryn Weathersby, “Stalin, Mao, and the End of the Korean War,” in Odd Arne Westad, ed., *Brothers in Arms: The Rise and Fall of the Sino-Soviet Alliance* (Washington, DC: Stanford, 1998), 90–117.

⁴⁷²Weathersby, “Stalin, Mao and the End of the Korean War,” 92; Katherine Weathersby, “To Attack or Not to Attack? Stalin, Kim Il Sung and the Prelude to War,” *Cold War International*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

American colossus and viewed the reunification of Korea as a strengthening of their defense lines against the enemy whose nuclear and conventional forces projected its power around the world. Both communist states were engaged in the reconstruction of their war-ravaged societies, and they wanted the West to have fewer assets in its apparent drive to encircle and strangle them. To both Stalin and Mao, totalitarian leaders with idiosyncratic methods and beliefs, the Korean War was a mixture of opportunity and romantic defense of their homelands. The personalist rule each man had created extended patronage systems built on mutual webs of self-interest between different power blocs. Their particular forms of communist ideology were integral to their respective rules and to millions of followers who had deep and consuming passions for those ideologies.⁴⁷³

At the moment of history when the Korean War began in 1950, the Soviets and the Chinese were allies against the common foe of the United States and the rest of the Western community of liberal states. The West and the United States connected to the Chinese and Soviets in the global contest between them. Clearly, the dream of proletarian internationalism, in which the West would crumble under the feet of angry workers around the colonial and postcolonial world, was a vision that Mao and Stalin retained for socialism. They hoped that the capitalists would collapse under the heat of socialism, activated at the heart of the industrial metropolises of the great Western powers. In this context, Korea was a test of socialism. It was a challenge for the West's ruling coalitions in their strategic quests for survival. Stalin, who made the Soviet state in his image, and Mao, who was to do the same for the Chinese communist state, could only have viewed the Korean War as a place to tie down the expansionist Americans and defeat them. It would be a place to demoralize them and force them to come to terms with the victory of the communists on the Asian mainland.⁴⁷⁴

The Korean Script

Korea was divided between the leftist procommunist and rightist pro-Western factions. At the very end of the Second World War, as the Japanese prepared to surrender, the Korean peninsula was divided along the forty-seventh parallel by the United States and the Soviet Union. That division became the ideological and political division between the right and the left in Korean society. Each side dominated one part of the peninsula under the auspices of its occupying power. Kim Il Sung viewed the Korean conflict as entirely peripheral to the Cold War. Although he was dedicated to the global objectives of the Soviet-led international communist movement, the liberation of Korea

History Project Bulletin 5 (*Spring 1995*): 1–9; Stueck, *The Korean War*, 31; Goncharov, Lewis, and Litai, *Uncertain Partners*, 137.

⁴⁷³Alfred J. Reiber, "Stalin: Man of the Borderlands," *American Historical Review* 106, no. 5 (*February 2002*): 1651–91; Shu Guang Zhang, *Mao's Military Romanticism: China and the Korean War, 1950–1953* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995), 12–16; Michael M. Sheng, *Battling Western Imperialism: Mao, Stalin and the United States* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 161–86.

⁴⁷⁴Zhang, *Mao's Military Romanticism*, 55–88.

after centuries of foreign domination was his essential goal. From the cultural perspective of Korean nationalism, the exigencies of Korean national liberation had little to do with the international Cold War. Although the Soviets provided the hardware, and later the Chinese provided troops as well as jets and pilots, the war aim for the Korean communists was to reunite a nation that had lost its sovereignty to Japan some forty years earlier.⁴⁷⁵ Korean communists had no use for capitalism or for foreigners of any kind on Korean soil. For Koreans, the center of the world was Korea. As with so many other insular cultures, traditional Korean belief held Korean civilization to be unique and exceptional. The Korean War pitted the Americans and South Koreans against an indigenous people who would fight as hard as the Russians during the siege of Stalingrad or the Jews in the Israeli war for independence. Despite the horrific punishment they absorbed from the U.S. and South Korean forces, the North Koreans survived with the backing of China and the Soviet Union.⁴⁷⁶

Koreans, as the Korean War scholar Bruce Cumings has observed, have a cultural myth about the wisdom of a society being invested in one charismatic leader. With Kim Il Sung having that mantle, Koreans were ready to obey him wherever his leadership took them. Divided after the 1953 armistice, the two Koreas led fully separate and utterly antagonistic lives as rival nation-states. American sponsorship provided the Republic of Korea with the same benefits of military and civilian aid as it provided the other front-line anticommunist regimes in the eastern Pacific. Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand all received generous American economic and military support throughout the period of the orthodox Cold War. The Korean sponsorship, however, lasted for the entirety of the Cold War and continued into the post-Cold War era.⁴⁷⁷

North Korea's sponsors, in contrast, largely deserted the country after 1990. The Soviets, of course, were bankrupt and could no longer aid a declining Stalinist regime in its far west region. The Chinese, no longer committed to the socialism practiced in that country, were loath to support such a repressive anti-Western regime that knew nothing of the outside world. The Koreans had started and indeed were the victims of their own national war. However, some fifty years after the war ended inconclusively, Koreans remained divided in a particular nationalist Korean script. It was not possible for the

⁴⁷⁵USC-UCLA Joint East Asian Studies Center, Treaty of Annexation, August 22, 1910, *East Asian Documents*, <http://www.isop.ucla.edu/eas/documents/kore1910.htm>; Cumings, *Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes*.

⁴⁷⁶Cumings, *The Roaring of the Cataract*, 666–707; Kevin Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies: The North Korean and Chinese Soldier in the Korean War* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 2001), 1–28; Stueck, *The Korean War*, 167–203; Thornton, *Odd Man Out*, 348–79.

⁴⁷⁷Jong-Sup Lee and Uk Heo, *The U.S.-South Korean Alliance, 1961–1988: Free-Riding or Bargaining?* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002); Kim Jung-Ik, *The Future of the U.S.-Republic of Korea Military Relationship* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996); Richard T. Detrio, *Strategic Partners: South Korea and the United States* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1989); Jonathan D. Pollack and Young Koo Cha, *A New Alliance for the Next Century: The Future of U.S.-Korean Security Cooperation* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1996).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

West, no matter how perceptive, to revise the script for the Koreans as they struggled with the possibilities of national reunification. The South Korean script, as it evolved in the orthodox period, was to modernize along Western lines, accepting the protection of the United States. An authoritarian market regime, dominated by large industrial conglomerates, progressed with the material assistance and military umbrella of every American administration. Whereas at the beginning of the Cold War the Korean peninsula was of doubtful value to the strategic defense of the West, its primacy became apparent only when the North Koreans, with the advice and support of their giant communist allies, attempted to reunify the country on the North's own terms. Then South Korea became not only an ally but also a strategic partner of incomparable worth.⁴⁷⁸

Indochina

The enormity of the American commitment to South Korea and Taiwan as well as Japan made the commitment to Indochina after the French defeat and withdrawal an absolute given. This commitment gained significance from the end of the Second World War on into the 1950s and 1960s, ultimately creating the confluence of interests and foreign policy disasters that turned the script and ended the orthodox era. In the literature, there are two explanations for the geostrategic significance of French Indochina to the United States in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The East Asian political economy explanation understands the region as vital to the economic revival of Japan. The liberal technocratic order required French Indochina's rice as well as Indonesia's oil and rubber. It also needed the potential markets of the Philippines, Indochina, Thailand, and Indonesia (then the Dutch East Indies) to restore Japan to the economic, political, and military asset it had the potential to be for the free world in Asia. The second explanation focuses on France and its importance to the construction of a rearmed and integrated Western European community. The loss of Indochina, from this Atlanticist perspective, would weaken the French just when the West needed a recovered France to defend Central Europe from Soviet encroachment. Both explanations make sense.⁴⁷⁹

In the end, the domino theory incorporated Indochina, and so the vital importance of the region to U.S. national security was a given. The United States spent billions of

⁴⁷⁸*Cummings*, *The Roaring of the Cataract*, 625–65; *Bruce Cummings*, *Korea's Place in the Sun: A Modern History* (New York: Norton, 1997), 299–393; *Robert J. Myers*, *Korea in the Cross Currents: A Century of Struggle and the Crisis of Reunification* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 97–153.

⁴⁷⁹*William J. Duiker*, *U.S. Containment Policy and the Conflict in Indochina* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), 88–172; *Andrew J. Rotter*, *The Path to Vietnam: Origins of the American Commitment to Southeast Asia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 165–203; *William S. Borden*, *The Pacific Alliance: United States Foreign Economic Policy and Japanese Trade Recovery, 1947–1955* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), 191–222; *Schaller*, *The American Occupation of Japan*; *Gary R. Hess*, *The United States' Emergence as a Southeast Asian Power, 1940–1950* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), 159–215; *Gibbons*, *The U.S. Government and the Vietnam War*, 1:71–119.

dollars supporting the French effort. When the French failed, their forces trapped at Dien Bien Phu, Eisenhower refused to supply the military force, either conventional or tactical nuclear, to save the French garrison. This led directly to the withdrawal of France from one of its most prized colonial possessions. From the point of view of the domino theory, this was a disaster. Nonetheless, the United States did not abandon Indochina, but installed pro-Western anticommunist regimes in all three countries of the region. The 1954 Geneva conference on Indochina and Korea divided Vietnam into halves. The southern zone was the successor regime to the Republic of Vietnam. The northern zone became the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, under the leadership of Vietnam's most charismatic leader, Ho Chi Minh.⁴⁸⁰

The origins of the Vietnam War were in the technocratic view of the Indochina War. The dimensions of the American commitment were found in its first strategic analysis of Indochina. National security analysts in the Pentagon, the State Department, and the National Security Council studied Indochina with immense interest. In numerous national security documents from the early and mid-1950s they concluded that the region was indeed an essential linchpin to contain Sino-Soviet power in Asia. Aid to the French was based on that strategic assessment. However, when, after eight years of warfare, the French had their backs against the wall at the battle of Dien Bien Phu, Eisenhower refused a rescue. A commitment to keep French forces in Indochina would have required American troops, and this Eisenhower refused to approve. It was more important that France withdraw from Indochina and support the development of NATO than to try to hold an untenable position ten thousand miles away. Ho Chi Minh and his organization, the Viet Minh, were only suspected of being communists when Eisenhower pulled out. It was known that they received aid from China and the Soviet Union, but Ho had not Stalinized his regime when the French lost the war in 1954. In fact, Ho had long been known by American policy makers to be the most popular Vietnamese nationalist leader. Congressional debate over American intervention centered on the idea of an "anticolonial struggle" in Indochina as late as spring 1954.⁴⁸¹

Nonetheless, the American commitment to French Indochina was based upon the assumption that indeed the Viet Minh were communists, and that all measures needed to be taken to replace the French administration with a nationalist but anticommunist Vietnamese republic. With the signing of the Geneva Accords of 1954, the Eisenhower administration acted in proactive fashion. Eisenhower sent a contingent of military and civilian advisers to South Vietnam to help build a country that was tottering on the verge

⁴⁸⁰Gibbons, *The U.S. Government and the Vietnam War*, 1:250–59; James Cable, *The Geneva Conference of 1954 on Indochina* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1999); Robert F. Randle, *Geneva 1954: The Settlement of the Indochinese War* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1969), 428–81; Duiker, *U.S. Containment Policy*, 173–93.

⁴⁸¹Gibbons, *The U.S. Government and the Vietnam War*, 1:89, 203–7; William J. Duiker, *Ho Chi Minh* (New York: Hyperion, 2000); Melanie Billings-Yun, *Decision against War: Eisenhower and Dien Bien Phu, 1954* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988); Bernard B. Fall, *Hell in a Very Small Place: The Siege of Dien Bien Phu* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1967).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

of dissolution. The CIA was instrumental in bringing Ngo Dinh Diem to power in Vietnam. Once Diem had stabilized the political situation in the south, the United States proceeded to embark upon a huge foreign aid program. Some two billion dollars in aid, an extraordinary sum, was sent to Diem between 1954 and 1963. His country needed to be built from the ground up. With respect to building the containment system, the pockets of the United States were very deep indeed. The complete modernization of South Vietnam became a fundamental project for American foreign policy, from the mid-1950s to the height of the Vietnam War in the late 1960s.⁴⁸²

China

The Chinese revolution was a seminal moment in the history of the Cold War, twentieth-century Chinese and East Asian history, and in American international history. Since the nineteenth century, the Chinese nation-state had been a permanent interest of the United States. In European history, the allure of China began in the Middle Ages with Marco Polo and expanded after the sixteenth century with Europe's formal trade and colonial ties to the region. The sheer size of the Chinese population, a quarter of the world's population, invited dreams of Western penetration and dominance. The size of such a country was unfathomable. It was the world's largest nation-state, so huge and yet so backward. When the communists finally prevailed in October 1949, the size of the Stalinist domain, by population, more than doubled in size. With China in the hands of Mao, the Soviet threat was far more pressing, at least in the eyes of American policy makers who viewed the communist victory with fear.⁴⁸³

Yet, the monolithic concept of communism ignored China as a nation unto itself. The intense nationalism that China had experienced since the nineteenth century was as great as that of any other modern nation. Chinese nationalism was imbued with modernity's worship of the nation-state. The Chinese script, situated in a dynastic history of some three thousand years and the Confucian philosophy of two thousand years, ran its course in the twentieth century. In China's extraordinary history as a civilization, Chinese technology, art, philosophy, and other accoutrements of success rivaled all that any European civilization had produced. As a great power, the Chinese Song dynasty was the most advanced in the world in the Western year 1000. Likely, the same was true of China at the time of Columbus. Yet, for reasons related to the insularity of its culture and empire, China declined in relative terms from the 1500s onward. The Manchus conquered

⁴⁸²Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 9–25; Gibbons, *The U.S. Government and the Vietnam War*, 1:311–20 and 4:53–66; John Ernst, *Forging a Fateful Alliance: Michigan State University and the Vietnam War (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998)*, 1–20; Douglas C. Dacy, *Foreign Aid, War, and Economic Development: South Vietnam, 1955–1975 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986)*, 192–239.

⁴⁸³China was seen as an instrument of Soviet power. See Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Review of the Current World Situation and Ability of the Forces Being Maintained to Meet United States Commitments," Washington, January 1951, *FRUS*, 1951, vol. 1, National Security Affairs, Foreign Economic Policy (Washington, DC: GPO, 1979), 62–81.

it in 1644, and it was never to be considered a great power again, at least until the last years of the second millennium.⁴⁸⁴

Dominated by foreigners since the seventeenth century and by Europeans from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries, the Chinese had fought a horrific war against the Japanese before the destruction of Japan at the hands of the Americans in 1945. In the wake of the Japanese war, the struggle between Chinese nationalists and communists returned. Previously, the death of imperial China in 1911 and the birth of a unified Chinese Republic under Sun Yat-sen led to the long struggle between the nationalists and the communists for sovereignty over the motherland. With the support of the people and the effective organizing techniques of communist movements around the world, Mao was quite effective at fighting his way south to Canton and Shanghai. Chiang Kai-shek and his Kuomintang army could not hold a single inch of the mainland with the Red Army penetrating every village and rural redoubt. However, as we know, the war between the anticommunist Chinese and the Maoists did not end when the communists finally seized all of mainland China. The nationalists, as fanatical in their beliefs as Mao's lieutenants, went to their own redoubt on the island of Taiwan. In exile, as the orthodox Cold War continued on, Chiang pondered his ability to return to the mainland and finish the war. What happened was another story entirely.⁴⁸⁵

In the end, the Chinese communists worried Truman and the redeemer nation immensely. Before Chinese forces penetrated the Korean peninsula in the fall of 1950, the country was seen as a growing menace. When Mao's forces surprised the Americans by crossing the Yalu and attacking the U.S. troops, scattering the American forces until General Matthew Ridgeway assumed command, the fear of China grew overnight. Deferring the use of nuclear weapons, Truman brought the war quickly to a stalemate. The problem for Truman remained what to do with the immensely huge and impoverished region that seemed incapable of self-government. The communists had now expanded their reach to the far sides of the earth. The possibilities of new communist

⁴⁸⁴ John King Fairbank, *China: A New History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Jonathan D. Spence, *The Search for Modern China* (New York: Norton, 1999), 231, and *The Chan's Great Continent: China in Western Minds* (New York: Norton, 1998).

⁴⁸⁵ Michael Hunt, *The Genesis of Chinese Communist Foreign Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 159–200; Odd Arne Westad, *Cold War and Revolution: Soviet-American Rivalry and the Origins of the Chinese Civil War, 1944–1946* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 140–64; Suzanne Pepper, *Civil War in China: The Political Struggle, 1945–1949* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 385–431; Arif Dirlik, *The Origins of Chinese Communism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Gregor Benton, *Mountain Fires: The Red Army's Three-Year War in South China, 1934–1938* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); Stephen Uhalley Jr., *A History of the Chinese Communist Party* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1988), 55–90; Benjamin Yang, *From Revolution to Politics: Chinese Communists on the Long March* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1990); Shum Kui-Kwong, *The Chinese Communists' Road to Power: The Anti-Japanese National United Front, 1935–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Marcia R. Ristaino, *China's Art of Revolution: The Mobilization of Discontent, 1927 and 1928* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

conquests throughout East and Southeast Asia, in addition to the Indian subcontinent and the Middle East, deeply troubled a president committed to the satisfactory containment and perhaps taming of international communism. By all accounts, the Chinese communists were not “paper tigers,” but absolutely ruthless in their application of Marxist-Leninist doctrine.⁴⁸⁶

Eisenhower’s experience with China was similar. He would not budge when faced with Chinese threats over the occupation of its offshore islands. In the mid-1950s he was advised to use nuclear weapons against such a recalcitrant foe. Yet, he refused the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs to use nuclear weapons in case of betrayal. The potential loss of millions of people did not disturb the Chinese leaders, as the country had lost so many millions in famines of the past. Eisenhower, however, in full recognition of what the weapons could do, never allowed his military the uncontrolled option. By the late 1950s, liberation movements in Vietnam, Indonesia, and elsewhere subscribed to the ideas of a “people’s war.” China held no allure to Eisenhower, but was seen as a military threat in the Third World. Mao’s “Great Leap Forward” was less than a leap but more a disastrous program aimed at the destruction of the last remains of capitalism in China. When China faced the United States in 1960, it had already begun its break with the Soviet Union. Mao saw the Chinese revolution not as unique to China, but as a revolutionary consciousness that could spread all over Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Americas. People’s war brought social, economic, and political equality according to the laws of Marxism and scientific socialist development.

In the United States, the Soviet Union, and China, the world struggled with three global civilizations intent upon redemption and salvation on their own terms. In the Chinese view, salvation through scientific socialism was exemplified by a predominately rural society that had rid itself of social class differences. In the Soviet Union, redemption was found in the “great patriotic war,” in which an entire generation of boys and girls had perished or disappeared into Europe. In the Sino-Soviet conflict/script, the incompatible

⁴⁸⁶ Alfred L. Chan, *Mao’s Crusade: Politics and Policy Implementation in China’s Great Leap Forward* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 76–108; Frederick C. Teiwes, *China’s Road to Disaster: Mao, Central Politicians, and Provincial Leaders in the Unfolding of the Great Leap Forward, 1955–1959* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1999), 177–212; David Bachman, *Bureaucracy, Economy, and Leadership in China: The Institutional Origins of the Great Leap Forward* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Jasper Becker, *Hungry Ghosts: Mao’s Secret Famine* (New York: Free Press, 1996), 83–129; Lynn T. White III, *Policies of Chaos: The Organizational Causes of Violence in China’s Cultural Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989), 3–49; Jin Qiu, *The Culture of Power: The Lin Biao Incident in the Cultural Revolution* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), 15–41; Yan Jiaqi, *Turbulent Decade: A History of the Cultural Revolution* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1996); Jing Lin, *The Red Guards’ Path to Violence: Political, Educational, and Psychological Factors* (New York: Praeger, 1991); Fox Butterfield, *China: Alive in the Bitter Sea* (New York: Times Books, 1982); Harry Harding, “The Chinese State in Crisis, 1966–69,” in Roderick MacFarquhar, ed., *The Politics of China: The Eras of Mao and Deng* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 148–247.

nature of the two powers and their hot rivalry for control of the international communist movement suggested war.⁴⁸⁷

European Crises: Berlin

It was apparent to the Allies that the destruction of Nazi Germany in 1945 did not make the Germans irrelevant to European and international history. Germany was perhaps the greatest prize in the history of warfare. It was a nation of enormous human potential, with advanced technologies in rocket science, armaments, submarines, and chemical warfare, as well as the means for rebuilding a world-class civilian industrial sector. Despite the genocide that the Nazi regime had inflicted upon Europe, the interest remained on the part of both the West and the Soviets to reform the German nation, using its potential to enhance the strength of their respective sides. The division of Germany was a matter of course. Given the circumstances of the Cold War, no feasible plan existed for the reunification of the nation-state. The German script had been to follow Hitler, to unite under a great leader who would lead the nation not to victory but to a modern version of Armageddon. In the aftermath, a new script for the Cold War was born, in which the Soviet and American versions of technocratic modernity would oppose one another. That opposition pitted German liberals and social democrats in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) against the German communists of the German Democratic Republic (GDR). The Cold War centered on one level upon the epistemologies of Cold War militarism, and on another level on the city of Berlin—the symbol of the Cold War at the center of Europe.

The Berlin crises of 1948 and 1958 through 1962 represented the pinnacle of the orthodox Cold War in Europe. Berlin was, of course, the center of gravity in a continent that was so essential to the future of the international community. “Who controls Berlin controls Germany, who controls Germany controls Europe, who controls Europe controls the world,” Lenin said. There were other European crises—the Hungarian revolution of 1956, the Greek civil war of 1945–1946, and Yugoslavia’s break with Stalin in 1948—but Berlin was paramount. It represented the focal point of the ideological and strategic rivalry between the two camps. Both sides viewed Berlin as an absolutely critical point. Khrushchev remarked, in a private conversation with Andrei Gromyko in 1961, that the Western powers were “crazy” if they thought the Soviets were going to let the German Democratic Republic collapse. Clearly, the presence of a free Western city in the heart of the GDR did threaten the very survival of the state. Every day that the city existed with free access from the eastern state, German refugees poured through the checkpoints to the West. Only the erection of the Berlin Wall allowed the GDR to stabilize its totalitarian regime for another twenty-eight years. Repeated Soviet attempts to close West Berlin off

⁴⁸⁷Raymond L. Garthoff, “Political and Military Issues in the Sino-Soviet Debate, 1963–65,” in Raymond L. Garthoff, ed., *Sino-Soviet Military Relations* (New York: F. A. Praeger 1966), 171–99; Donald S. Zagoria, *The Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1956–1961* (New York: Atheneum, 1964); David C. Levine, *The Rift: The Sino-Soviet Conflict* (Jacksonville, IL: Harris-Wolfe, 1968).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

from the remainder of the Federal Republic were a brazen strategy to challenge the city's existence.⁴⁸⁸

The strategy failed with three successive American administrations and British governments. The 1948–1949 blockade did not deter Truman and Churchill from maintaining a very expensive and exhausting airlift of supplies to the city. In 1958, Soviet threats against the city failed again, even with the danger of nuclear war hanging over the heads of the Eisenhower administration. In June 1961, as the Berlin question once again reached the stage of nearly requiring the Kennedy administration to order a national emergency, Dean Acheson wrote a white paper on the strategic significance of the city. In Acheson's view, the administration had to be prepared to use nuclear weapons to defend West Berlin. Without that willingness, the Soviets would have a free hand to overrun the city and thereby emasculate the Federal Republic of Germany.

Unlike in the cases of Vietnam and Korea, the usual division between hawks and doves or military realists and neo-Wilsonian internationalists was not clearly present over the issue of Berlin. Whether the approach to the Cold War was diplomatic or military or managerial/technocratic, the basic premise against appeasement was plain. When the Soviets threatened war on the status of the city, the consensus view of the major political actors in the United States establishment was to hold steadfast.⁴⁸⁹ There seemed to be a near universal concept of American strategic interest in its former adversary. The idea of going to war in Europe to defend the continent from domination by the Soviet Union was one that carried currency even with the small minority of liberals who sat in the Senate. Germany, and hence all of Europe, was vastly more important in public perception than the lesser quicksand wars found in East Asia and elsewhere.

The Middle East

The Suez crisis was significant mainly because of its symbolism. The eclipse of the British and French empires, which had dominated the world for two hundred years, was symbolically complete with their humiliation in 1956. The Egyptian president and charismatic leader of postwar pan-Arabism in the Middle East, Gamal Abdul Nassar,

⁴⁸⁸Avi Shlaim, *The United States and the Berlin Blockade, 1948–1949: A Study in Crisis Decision-Making* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Jack M. Schick, *The Berlin Crisis, 1958–1962* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971); Vladislav M. Zubok, *Khrushchev and the Berlin Crisis (1958–1962)* (Washington, DC: Cold War International History Project, Woodrow Wilson Center, 1993).

⁴⁸⁹State Department, "Report of Dean Acheson," Washington, June 28, 1961, *FRUS*, 1961–1963, vol. 14, Berlin Crisis, 1961–1962 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1993), 138–59; Curtis Cate, *The Ides of August: The Berlin Wall Crisis—1961* (New York: M. Evans, 1978); Robert M. Slusser, *The Berlin Crisis of 1961: Soviet-American Relations and the Struggle for Power in the Kremlin, June–November 1961* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); Honore Marc Catudal, *Kennedy and the Berlin Wall Crisis: A Case Study in U.S. Decision Making* (Berlin: Berlin-Verlag, 1980); Hope M. Harrison, *Ulbricht and the Concrete "Rose": New Archival Evidence on the Dynamics of Soviet–East German Relations and the Berlin Crisis, 1958–1961* (Washington, DC: Cold War International History Project, Woodrow Wilson Center, 1993).

occupied the Suez Canal. The defiance of the Western European powers by the Egyptian army would not have stood by itself. However, Eisenhower refused to accept the neocolonial attitude of the Europeans. The president used his power, that of the United States—its dominant military, political, and economic strength—to force the withdrawal of British, French, and Israeli forces from the canal and Sinai Peninsula. Unwilling to support Anglo-French imperialism even when the issue was the strategic control of the Suez Canal, Eisenhower demanded and received the withdrawal of the British, French, and Israeli troops in the wake of Nasser's seizure of the canal in the name of Egyptian nationhood. What later troubled American analysts and statesmen was the coincidence of the Suez crisis with the Hungarian revolution of 1956. The revolution had failed, and the Soviets consolidated their control over Hungary.⁴⁹⁰

Middle Eastern concerns for Truman and Eisenhower were significant, if not as critical as for later American presidents who faced the strategic challenge of protecting supplies of global petroleum from the Persian Gulf. Clearly, the Gulf was an essential area of concern, not only for its proven oil reserves, which were growing rapidly, but for its location between the Indian subcontinent and the Mediterranean. In strategic terms, communist penetration of Iran or Iraq or any of the states in the region represented a thrust southward to the Indian Ocean. Giving the Soviets a warm-water port on the Indian Ocean would increase the potential of the Soviet fleet as an international blue-water navy capable of controlling vital sea-lanes. To prevent this, the Truman administration overthrew the Mossadegh regime in Iran in 1953. In Iraq, in the early 1960s, the United States supported the destruction of the Iraqi communist party. The same patterns followed in the Middle East as elsewhere. Both Soviet and American agents were engaged in attempted penetration and co-opting of regimes.⁴⁹¹

Toward the New Frontier: Cuba, Laos, and Berlin 1960

The last year of the Eisenhower administration was the height of the orthodox Cold War. Around the world, the communist movement showed strength. There were active

⁴⁹⁰Interagency Report, *Special National Intelligence Estimate SNIE 11-9-56*, "Sino-Soviet Intentions in the Suez Crisis," Washington, November 6, 1956, *FRUS*, 1955–67, vol. 16, Suez Crisis, July 26–December 31, 1956 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1990), 1018–20; D. Cole and C. Kingseed, *Eisenhower and the Suez Crisis of 1956* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 102–47; Donald Neff, *Warriors at Suez: Eisenhower Takes America into the Middle East* (New York: Linden Press/Simon & Schuster, 1981); David Carlton, *Britain and the Suez Crisis* (New York: Blackwell, 1989); William Roger Louis and Roger Owen, eds., *Suez 1956: The Crisis and Its Consequences* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Anthony Gorst and Lewis Johnman, *The Suez Crisis* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

⁴⁹¹Homa Katouzian, *Musaddiq and the Struggle for Power in Iran* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), 177–207; Donald Wilber, *CIA Clandestine Service History*, "Overthrow of Premier Mossadeq of Iran, November 1952–August 1953," March 1954, *National Security Archive*, The Secret History of the Iran Coup, 1953, [261](http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB28/Fuqua to Sloan. Washington, February 8, 1963, FRUS, 1961–1963, vol. 18, Near East, 1962–1963 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1995), 342–43.</p></div><div data-bbox=)

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

communist movements in the former French Indochina, Indonesia, the Korean peninsula, Thailand, and elsewhere in Asia. Communist intellectuals and activists were engaged in the battle for the free world all over Latin America and the Caribbean, in Western Europe and the Middle East. While “freedom” was the battle cry of the conservatives in the West who wanted to “roll back” the communists, there was little indication that that was going to happen soon. Instead, the confrontation between the two separate ideological systems remained. Neither side showed the slightest inkling toward détente. The Chinese and the Soviets were on the verge of an ideological split that would turn their alliance into a potentially deadly rivalry, but the ice had not thawed between the free world and the socialists. The United States remained on track in its designs on containing the Soviet Union. The country moved forward in its public mission to expand the national frontier into near-earth space. As a result of Sputnik, a large effort had been made to strengthen science education in the United States as a matter of national security. While the country remained very prosperous, it was devoting a very large percentage of its peacetime revenues to national defense. The country was proud and resolute in its opposition to communism, even with the self-acknowledged dangers of extremism in foreign affairs. All around the world, the containment system appeared to be under siege. There seemed to be an unending requirement to counter the growth of communist movements. The most serious situations perceived by the Eisenhower administration were in Indochina, Cuba, and Berlin.

The situation in Indochina—in particular, Laos—promised to involve American troops, as communist forces made advances toward taking control of the country. When Eisenhower briefed Kennedy just prior to his inauguration, the concern Eisenhower delivered to his successor had to do with Laos. From Eisenhower’s perspective, the imminent loss of Laos would trigger the most serious consequences of the domino theory. Kennedy, who assented to the requirements of Cold War orthodoxy, agreed with Eisenhower’s assessment. Laos was the key to Indochina, which in turn was the key to Southeast Asia. Basic national security doctrine circa 1960 asserted that the chain of countries likely to fall to communism would remain contiguous. If South Vietnam fell, it would trigger the same set of dominoes that would be triggered if Laos fell. Further, the fall of India or Pakistan or Burma would cause communism to spread like wildfire across the containment perimeter of Asia.⁴⁹²

The situation in Cuba was just the same. Castro had come into power ostensibly as a revolutionary hero. Overnight it became apparent that his true colors were those of the communist international. He had soon announced his views as those of a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary when the Eisenhower administration broke off relations and began to plan immediately for his overthrow. Around the world, U.S. interests in protecting the free world were compromised by the growing communist liberation movements. It was

⁴⁹²White House, “Notes of Conversation between President-Elect Kennedy and President Eisenhower,” Washington, January 19, 1961, FRUS, 1961–1963, vol. 24, Laos Crisis, 1961–1963 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1984), 18–20; Cliff Herter, “Memorandum for the Record,” Washington, January 19, 1961, *ibid.*, 22–25.

now more necessary than ever that the United States deploy additional Cold War stratagems to defeat the enemy. The new stratagem espoused by John F. Kennedy as one of his singular contributions to the Cold War was “CI,” or “counterinsurgency” warfare. In a way, CI violated the culture of the orthodox Cold War. It would not support the centralized, controlled institutional nature of nuclear and conventional warfare that had developed so impressively during the 1940s and 1950s.⁴⁹³

As the decade of the 1960s and the last year of the Eisenhower administration began, John F. Kennedy and his new frontier were not yet a reality or even an eventuality. The future of the presidency hung between Kennedy and Eisenhower’s vice president, Richard Nixon. Kennedy’s style and spirit were crafted to enthuse youth. His views were in line with Adlai Stevenson’s; liberalism defined his script in both domestic and international affairs. Nixon, the famous rival, lost the presidency by a few thousand votes in Illinois and Texas. A scientific appraisal of the outcome reveals only a random variation; Kennedy’s election was no more likely than Nixon’s, and the “Age of Camelot” was not destiny but simply a statistical outcome of an evenly divided electorate. The American metascript, a complex adaptive system, may have simply “adapted” to the election of one man rather than the other. Another hypothesis suggests that Kennedy’s election was always far more likely than Nixon’s, and that Kennedy’s crafted performance in the famous 1960 presidential debates was his path to victory. Nixon, who sweated under the lights, lost because that was part of his script—his particular life path, which would take him to the presidency eight years later and to political destruction some six years after that.⁴⁹⁴

Several different tracks for warfare, the space race, computers, and the nuclear arms race all remained on the table for the new president as Eisenhower ended his stable if uninspiring eight years in the White House. The virulent anticommunism of the McCarthy years was gone, although only barely. The country remained in its self-perceived fortress, surrounded by deadly communists who saw the United States in kind as a deadly adversary. The domestic script, and ultimately the script for the Cold War, would turn with Kennedy and his new frontier. He won the election of 1960, but, as noted, by a margin exceedingly below what could be considered decisive. Yet, Kennedy was elected, and he was the perfect transition figure from the orthodox Cold War to the

⁴⁹³Welch, *Response to Revolution*, 64–100; Stephen G. Rabe, *The Most Dangerous Area in the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 125–47; Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 1–80; Andrew F. Krepinevich Jr., *The Army and Vietnam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 27–127.

⁴⁹⁴Theodore H. White, *The Making of the President, 1960* (New York: Pocket Books, 1961), 279–344; Christopher Matthews, *Kennedy and Nixon: The Rivalry That Shaped Postwar America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 133–56; Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965); Irving Bernstein, *Promises Kept: John F. Kennedy’s New Frontier* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Gerald S. and Deborah H. Strober, *Let Us Begin Anew: An Oral History of the Kennedy Presidency* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 1–69.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

revisionist period. His personality and frame of reference, as a function of his personal beliefs, culture, and political alliances, made him so.⁴⁹⁵ Still, the full work of Kennedy's revision of the Cold War would come to fruition only after his death; then the tumult over Vietnam jettisoned the rhetoric and repetitive behaviors particular to the orthodox Cold War. In the agency of John F. Kennedy, the country would struggle with conflicting postures toward the Soviet Union and the international communist movement. Kennedy's penchant, his animus, required a neo-Wilsonian view of the world. Yet the national script was complex, containing separate and conflicting imperatives for organizing international relations and American foreign policy. The national script and the metascript for the Cold War would turn in the 1960s. The ramifications of the Cold War in the 1960s would haunt the legacy of the figure most responsible for its turn—John F. Kennedy. The last president of the orthodox era, he would move the country toward a world that would challenge the United States to its very core.

⁴⁹⁵Pierre Salinger, *With Kennedy* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 250–83, 319–29; Theodore C. Sorensen, *Kennedy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 509–757.

Chapter VI

The Turn of the Script: Vietnam and the Anti–Cold War

The Rise of the Counterscript

The orthodox Cold War turned in the 1960s. Yet, at the start of the Kennedy administration, there was no inkling that that would happen. In the minds of leading American policy makers and intellectuals, the threat from the Soviets was palpable. The collective memory of the enormous calamity that was the Second World War was etched into the national scripts of the superpowers some fifteen and twenty years after victory day. When, on a very cold day in January, John F. Kennedy gave his famous inaugural address, the containment system he alluded to had become a truly enormous edifice. Thousands of nuclear weapons, planes, and ships and millions of allied soldiers were under his command. In the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev threatened the West with nuclear Armageddon. The rim of containment extended from North America through Western and Central Europe, around the southern and eastern borders of communist Asia, and up across the northern Pacific to the Aleutian Islands. It encompassed the entire Pacific and Indian Oceans, which were guarded by the U.S. Navy's Pacific command, by itself the most powerful naval force on earth. Around the world, intelligence posts listened to the communist mainland, which, including both the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, was larger than the Mongol empire of the thirteenth century. In strategic and geographic terms, containment was the most ambitious military plan ever attempted or achieved by any empire. Subtracting the land areas of the Soviet Union and China, as well as their small satellite countries that were part of the communist bloc, the containment structure sought to protect 70 percent of the world's landmass, and more than 90 percent of the earth's total surface. It was a spectacular peacetime project for

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

national defense—the most expansive ever—but it was one undertaken with complete seriousness.⁴⁹⁶

So it was, on a cold winter day in January 1961, that John F. Kennedy became president of the United States. His short presidency, less than three years, or the “thousand days” of Arthur Schlesinger Jr., was the last one of the orthodox Cold War. It was a time of momentous forces applied to American society. Internal dissent over the apartheid race laws still in place, and a growing protest movement against the overall race/class structure of a proudly liberal society, threatened the international prestige of the United States. Externally, the modernization of the former colonial regions of Africa and Asia, and the semifeudal praetorian regimes of the Americas, promised to promote instability of both a political and social nature. It also suggested the likelihood of communist expansion in the newly named “Third World.”⁴⁹⁷

The Kennedy presidency began with orthodoxy in full control. Kennedy and his nation battled the Soviets in Europe, in the Caribbean, and in Southeast Asia. America understood itself to be a society embroiled in a global war, contested through the proxies of propaganda, guerrilla wars, and a massive military arms race. Then Kennedy did something; he tried, albeit gingerly given the domestic political risks, to break out of the Cold War orthodoxy. He was trying to do that before he died, by negotiating a nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviets. Then Johnson carried forward Kennedy’s legacy but became entangled in the institutional forces of global containment. Johnson’s war broke the orthodox Cold War, rendering it vulnerable to savage attacks against its legitimacy, both inside the United States and abroad. With orthodoxy’s decline, the prestige of the United States lessened. Vietnam unleashed a torrent of anti-American sentiment, from the Americas to Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and, not least in importance, Western Europe. Once again, as in the 1930s, the legitimacy of the liberal technocratic order came under serious attack. Anti-Western and procommunist movements throughout the world challenged the institutional and cultural dominance of the West. In particular, they argued against the expanded presence of the United States outside of its territorial boundaries. In Southeast Asia, the American armed forces suffered their first and only comprehensive defeat at the hands of a peasant army. Vietnam was part of the turn of the script; it led to the militant anti-Americanism that was so prominent in the Middle East beginning in the 1970s.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹⁶Brodie, *Strategy in the Missile Age*; *Rockefeller Brothers Fund, The Mid-century Challenge to U.S. Foreign Policy. Panel I Report of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund Special Studies Project (Garden City: Doubleday, 1959)*; Max F. Milliken and W. W. Rostow, *A Proposal: Key to an Effective Foreign Policy (New York: Harper & Row, 1957)*; Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 1–4.

⁴⁹⁷Schlesinger, *A Thousand Days*, 506–619, 759–93; *Text of Kennedy’s inaugural address*, p. 8.

⁴⁹⁸Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 198–273; Gibbons, *The U.S. Government and the Vietnam War*; Schwab, *Defending the Free World*, 153–210; *David Kaiser, American Tragedy: Kennedy, Johnson, and the Origins of the Vietnam War (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000)*.

As noted, the orthodox script created a common view among Americans about the intent and nature of international communism. It molded a society able to maintain an unprecedented level of militarization, even in peacetime. The Kennedy administration continued the military and civilian programs for national defense, and, indeed, it expanded many of them. The Kennedy containment doctrine was linked to Keynesian, not neoclassical fiscal policy. Kennedy was deeply worried about the outflow of gold as a result of foreign aid commitments, but his agenda went beyond that of Eisenhower in expanding the capabilities of the U.S. military. The Eisenhower administration had worked on the big strategic projects that projected American power. Eisenhower's nuclear deterrent became a truly global arsenal of thermonuclear devices. Kennedy continued the nuclear and conventional military buildup, but he also embraced the concept of counterinsurgency, a form of warfare that mixed small arms with progressive Wilsonian ideals in American foreign policy. In doing so, he expanded American capabilities in the Third World.⁴⁹⁹

The script turned when Kennedy and Johnson and the legion of actors who defined the 1960s constructed a short historical epoch, lasting no more than ten years, when the forces of social change altered the Cold War, at least until it returned to neo-orthodoxy in the 1980s. Between 1961 and 1980, the script turned. The Cold War changed with the social and political context of international relations. During the 1960s, American society absorbed the assassinations of the Kennedy brothers and of Martin Luther King Jr. The civil rights marches, the urban riots, and the television war in Southeast Asia turned the culture and the fabric of politics in the United States. Elsewhere in the sixties, American culture, like a virus, swept through Europe and Asia, bringing the new rock music and drug culture across thousands of miles of ocean. As the events of the sixties unfolded, the American narrative turned upon itself. It was as if everything that had been understood, implicitly, by Americans about their culture was now reversed. Traditional saccharin American pride in the country's position in the world was replaced by a mood nearly opposite. Instead of a heroic America, a redeeming body of people doing good work for the world and fulfilling a self-defined societal destiny, the national dialogue from the early 1960s to the end of the Carter administration was one focused on loss, hypocrisy, and national humiliation.⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁹Bowie, *Waging Peace*, 149–201; Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 217–18; Campbell Craig, *Destroying the Village: Eisenhower and Thermonuclear War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998). *For balance of payments and gold-flow concerns in the Kennedy administration, see State Department, Memorandum, Adenauer Visit, Washington, April 12–13, 1961, FRUS, 1961–1963, vol. 9, Foreign Economic Policy* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1995), 114–16; *White House, Heller to Kennedy, August 30, 1962, ibid.*, 138–41; *White House, Dillon to Kennedy, Washington, August 31, 1961, ibid.*, 122–26.

⁵⁰⁰Terry H. Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Adam Garfinkle, *Telltale Hearts: The Origins and Impact of the Vietnam Antiwar Movement* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995); Alice Echols, *Shaky Ground: The Sixties and Its Aftershocks* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002); Kimball, *The Long March*; Farrell, *The Spirit of the Sixties*; Alexander Bloom, ed., *Long Time Gone: Sixties America Then and Now*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Media images from the time period show the script as almost transparent to the observer. In Cuba, the failed Bay of Pigs invasion and the chilling danger of the Cuban Missile Crisis, with its genuine prospect of a nuclear holocaust, marred the image of a great superpower commanding the globe. The coup against an American ally, the Diem regime of South Vietnam, once more challenged the integrity and efficacy of the containment system. Then the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and the unresolved nature of it, confronted the nation with a profound trauma. Those crises—and there were many others, including the domestic crises related to the black civil rights movement— informed the even greater national crises of the Johnson and Nixon administrations, when the enormity of social discontent over race and the Vietnam War generated extraordinary social change. Indeed, those forces were strong enough to convert millions of Americans to a lifestyle that rejected almost all aspects of postwar American civil society.⁵⁰¹

The historical narrative is familiar: the confluence of societal tectonics in the 1960s (technocratic corporate culture, nuclear weapons, and permanent war preparation) was juxtaposed against an emerging antiestablishment culture. Against the images of square dark-glass corporate buildings, crew cuts, and IBM punch cards, the revisionist Cold War engendered a new bohemia, a countercultural movement that swept through American universities, as well as those in Europe and elsewhere around the world. The orthodox Cold War would crumble under the images of the mass media. There was the naked child with napalm burns running from a South Vietnamese village, and a Southern policeman unleashing his dog on a calm black man who offered nothing but “passive resistance.” Then there were the images of rioters burning looted stores in American cities, and huge marches of anti-Vietnam War protesters surrounding government buildings and demanding an end to the war. Those marches and demonstrations galvanized the public in the late sixties and early seventies; ultimately, they included people from all walks of American life.⁵⁰²

From the early 1960s through the late 1970s, images poured out of television sets into the proverbial living rooms of American families and splashed across newspapers and

(New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle, eds., *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and '70s* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Joan Morrison and Robert K. Morrison, *From Camelot to Kent State: The Sixties Experience in the Words of Those Who Lived It* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Michael Bibby, ed., *The Vietnam War and Postmodernity* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999); John Carlos Rowe and Richard Berg, eds., *The Vietnam War and American Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Robert Buzzanco, *Vietnam and the Transformation of American Life* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999); Bruce J. Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (New York: Free Press, 2001); Gerald Messadieu, *Requiem pour superman: La crise du mythe américain* (Paris: R. Laffont, 1988); Andrew Hacker, *The End of the American Era* (New York: Atheneum, 1970); Philip Slater, *The Pursuit of Loneliness: American Culture at the Breaking Point* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970); Jerome H. Skolnick, ed., *Crisis in American Institutions* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970).

⁵⁰¹ Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties*, 241–91.

⁵⁰² *Ibid.*, 293–353.

newsmagazines informing Americans, and the world, that the country had undergone a fundamental change in the tone and substance of its historical narrative. For the essential actors involved, it did not seem as if the dramatic and extraordinary events of the era had been planned, either by them or by an invisible force. On the contrary, they had only continued to do what they always did. The Kennedy administration had not planned the Cuban Missile Crisis. The Johnson administration had not planned the Vietnam War or the Tet offensive. The Nixon administration did not plan the rise of Islamic fundamentalism or the energy crisis of the 1970s. Nor did the Ford or Carter administrations plan for Soviet expansion into Africa and the Middle East, nor did they anticipate the Iranian hostage crisis, the second oil shock, or the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. A world that appeared menacing in 1961 was not much friendlier in 1980, but American society and the cosmopolitan society of the West had changed significantly.

The Missile Crisis

The decision-making related to the Soviet deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Cuba in a period of thirteen days in October 1962 is perhaps the most heavily documented and best analyzed of any group process in human history. Tens of thousands of pages of primary documents are now available in American and Soviet archives. Over several decades, conferences held in Moscow, Washington, and Havana have examined the psychological, political, and strategic considerations that impacted two small groups of leaders and advisers working feverishly and simultaneously in two separate parts of the world. The two great crises of the orthodox Cold War were Korea and the Cuban Missile Crisis. As we have seen, the Korean War crisis forced the United States to respond in a way for which it was unprepared. As with earlier wars in the century, Korea triggered an American commitment to defend its national interest in a relatively remote area of the world. Quickly and reflexively, the country followed the scripted path over the legacy of Pearl Harbor and Munich. With the bold assault on the U.S. position, the dictates for NSC 68 were given full force. The country rearmed at breakneck speed, expanding the postwar national security state into its mid- and late twentieth-century form. The redeemer nation survived Korea and the other crises of the 1950s. Nonetheless, as the Kennedy administration encountered the nuclear challenge of the Soviets, it was clearly apparent that in Cuba, the luck that had followed the nation from the eighteenth century had nearly run out.⁵⁰³

⁵⁰³Robert F. Kennedy, *Thirteen days: A Memoir of the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: Norton, 1971), 102–11; James G. Blight, *On the Brink: Americans and Soviets Reexamine the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: Noonday, 1990), 204–14; Weisbrot, *Maximum Danger*, 203–14; L. V. Scott, *Macmillan, Kennedy, and the Cuban Missile Crisis: Political, Military, and Intelligence Aspects* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 153–89; Allison and Zelikow, *Essence of Decision*; Aleksandr Fursenko and Timothy Naftali, *One Hell of a Gamble: Khrushchev, Castro, and Kennedy, 1958–1964* (New York: Norton, 1997); *State Department, Kennedy to Khrushchev, Washington, October 22, 1962, FRUS, 1961–1963, vol. 6, Kennedy-Khrushchev Exchanges*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

There were no plans in the founders' design for how to fight a nuclear war. In the Cuban Missile Crisis, strategic dramaturgy of the most serious kind tested the nature of the contest between the superpowers. When Kennedy and Khrushchev contemplated a nuclear exchange as a result of their confrontation over Cuba, the terms of the metascript became transparent. As the superpowers faced each other in the Florida Straits, the two leaders weighed the meaning of the modern age. Nuclear weapons had only been used against Japan in 1945. In seventeen years, the technological capabilities of nuclear exchange had multiplied geometrically. Clearly, Kennedy had the superior force of some thousands of weapons with a "throw weight" of ten thousand megatons. With hundreds of operational ICBMs at his disposal, compared to the relative handful in the hands of Khrushchev, the American leader could bargain from a position of strength. Nonetheless, even if he knew, as so many military and civilian advisers had told him, that he had to respond militarily in the last instance if no Soviet withdrawal was forthcoming, the result was meaningless. His superiority was nearly meaningless because it still meant that tens of millions of Americans would die in a Soviet strike or counterstrike.⁵⁰⁴

The overriding question for historians of the twentieth century remains: What was the meaning and consequences of the crisis? From the perspective suggested in this synthesis, the crisis was connected to many others that occurred over twenty years. We can begin with the twin Cuban crises of the Bay of Pigs and the Missile Crisis and the crisis over Berlin in 1961–1962. Then we will end in southwestern Asia at the end of the Carter administration, when the Iranian and Afghan crises shattered the shaken pride of a self-described chosen nation. For two decades, American power was primarily reactive to the deep anti-Western sentiments and revolutions that occurred throughout the Third World. The end of European colonialism unleashed centuries of repressed anger against the old imperialist powers. For the United States, the inheritor of so much of the imperial imprimatur, the costs were an increased burden for the containment system, as each of the world's regions posed problems for the projection of American power.⁵⁰⁵

In Cuba, the technocratic scripts for the two superpowers came to a frightening impasse. Though both the United States and the Soviet Union had spent the time since the end of the Second World War working furiously to build nuclear arsenals of maximum

(Washington, DC: GPO, 1996), 165–66. Kennedy concluded his short letter with one cogent sentence: "I hope that your government will refrain from any action which would widen or deepen this already grave crisis and that we agree to resume the path of peaceful negotiations" (166).

⁵⁰⁴Robert S. McNamara, *The Essence of Security: Reflections in Office* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 51–67; Eugene Burdick, *Fail Safe* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962); Richard Fryklund, *100 Million Lives: Maximum Survival in a Nuclear War* (New York: Macmillan, 1962); Arthur Lee Burns, *The Rationale of Catalytic War* (Princeton, NJ: Woodrow Wilson Center for Public and International Affairs, 1959); Herbert S. Dinerstein, *War and the Soviet Union: Nuclear Weapons and the Revolution in Soviet Military and Political Thinking* (New York: Praeger, 1959).

⁵⁰⁵W. W. Rostow, *Basic National Security Plan 1962*, *Johnson VP Papers*, Lyndon Baines Johnson Library, Austin, Texas; Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 200; Gelb and Betts, *The Irony of Vietnam*; American Security Council, *National Strategy Committee*, *Guidelines for Cold War Victory* (Chicago: American Security Council Press, 1964).

throw weight and accuracy, each power understood its own behavior as defensive. The necessity of building weapons a thousand or more times more destructive than the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs was understood, implicitly, as a vital national response to the objectives of the other side. For more than twenty years, since the initial buildup of the U.S. military before Pearl Harbor, the United States had developed its military capabilities steadily and, quite often, rapidly to effect the proper strategic balance that existed in the world. From the Soviets' perspective, the exponential growth in American military power since 1940 demonstrated a serious threat to their interests. The Soviets believed that placing missiles in Cuba would both guarantee the survival of the Cuban revolution and redress the preponderant advantage enjoyed by the United States in the nuclear arms race. The American perspective was that the Soviets had, once again, showed boldness and treachery. To allow the Soviets to establish a nuclear arsenal and military base within a hundred miles of Florida was unthinkable to any American government. Yet, the Soviets viewed the Americans through their own history. The West had betrayed them during the First World War and the Second World War. No American could comprehend the national destruction visited upon the Soviet Union by the German army.

As with all major foreign policy crises, the documents on the decision making illuminate the entire structure—bureaucratic, psychological, and cultural—that embodies the agency of the decision makers. In the Cuban Missile Crisis, two powerful scripts communicated with each other. Both the United States and the Soviet Union saw their mutual relationship as the highest-stakes game. Truly massive and global national security structures, dedicated to preparing for world war involving nuclear and nonnuclear forces, found themselves poised in confrontation over the missile deployment. The American reaction was swift and menacing. A Soviet missile battery ninety miles off the coast of Florida could rain massive destruction over more than half the population of the country in a matter of minutes. The prospects of appeasing such an aggressive action were nil.

The Soviet move, immensely dangerous, was thought to have been provoked by the actions of the Kennedy administration vis-à-vis Cuba, a new and extremely important Soviet ally. The Soviets surmised that the fate of the Cuban revolution depended upon its ability to deter an American invasion (as was the case early in 1961, the first months of the Kennedy administration). From Khrushchev's perspective, the honor and integrity of the socialist, that is, Marxist-Leninist, alliance against world capitalism depended upon the Soviets' goodwill toward their socialist brothers in the Caribbean. So, the deployment of the missiles was inspired more by fear and a desire for a credible deterrent than by a desire to gain strategic superiority over the United States.⁵⁰⁶

⁵⁰⁶*Cold War International History Project*, "Russian Documents on the Cuban Missile Crisis," <http://cwihip.si.edu/cwihiplib.nsf> (see especially "Telegram of Soviet Ambassador to Cuba A. I. Alekseev to the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs [MFA], 7 September 1962"); Gribkov, *Operation ANADYR*, 12–15.

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

American policy makers and the informed public, however, could hardly be expected to ever accept Soviet admonishments that they were only acting in a defensive mode. The standoff between the superpowers very quickly became one of extraordinary tension and almost sublime danger. Here, in the year 1962, less than a generation after the death camps at Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen, military planners on both sides were compelled to contemplate the unthinkable. The script required ongoing massive investment in nuclear weapons research and development. The space program and research in the new fields of microelectronics and mainframe data processing systems were all related to the development of intercontinental and theater strategic weapons. The American script went all the way to the brink, and the Soviet script did the same, only blinking at the last moment when the reality of thermonuclear warfare became far too clear.⁵⁰⁷

The Aftermath

After the missile crisis, both sides quickly reflected upon how close they had come to Armageddon. Clearly, the encounter came very close to that. One can speculate about the counterfactual consequences of Richard Nixon being president. Would he have gone with the more aggressive military strategies proposed, including a unilateral invasion of Cuba? Would this have led to a nuclear exchange? What if the navy had fired upon a Soviet supply ship, if only accidentally? What if any number of variable events had turned out ever so slightly differently? Would the laws of order and chaos have turned world history tragically in another direction? By definition, all counterfactual speculations are unknowable. They cannot be known, at least to the satisfaction of historians, because they never happened, and because history is not an experimental science, they are not testable propositions.

What we know to some degree is how the group psychology of both sides changed with the near catastrophic crisis. There were earlier and later crises that triggered high states of danger in the nuclear Cold War. After 1962, the Soviets remained more determined than ever to match and even exceed the nuclear capabilities of their adversary. The Soviets never again created a comparable nuclear confrontation. As Nikita Khrushchev said in a famous speech, nuclear war would leave a society “where the living would envy the dead.” Yet, Khrushchev was deposed precisely because he appeased Kennedy. The Americans converted the aftermath of the crisis into a worldwide propaganda victory. Hardened by two generations of cataclysmic war and brutal Stalinist rule, the proffering of American victory was intolerable to the Soviet nomenklatura. The Soviets would not allow American superiority in nuclear weapons. Consequently, the Soviet Union’s nuclear deterrent grew enormously in effective force between the 1960s and the 1980s. Aside from a deep aversion to another dangerous missile confrontation, the Soviet script for international relations hardly changed. The Soviet technocratic state, immense and obsessed with global war, continued its production and development of

⁵⁰⁷ Weisbrot, *Maximum Danger*, 76–110; Fursenko and Naftali, *One Hell of a Gamble*, 240–89; Kahn, *On Thermonuclear War*, 453–74.

gigantic nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. By the 1980s, giant multimegaton Soviet missiles numbering in the hundreds threatened the destruction of the United States in minutes, including the seemingly impregnable NORAD headquarters built inside of Cheyenne Mountain, Colorado.⁵⁰⁸

For the United States, however, the missile crisis of 1962 did not galvanize the state to accelerate its nuclear development. On the contrary, the public experience of the crisis reinforced neo-Wilsonian ideology. It strengthened the public's fear of confronting the Soviets in ways favored by the political right. The Clausewitzian view of the Cold War required commanders to seize the initiative and attack the enemy with overwhelming force. This concept of the Cold War, generally understood as military realism and expounded by conservative military leaders, lost ground in its ability to influence the technocratic state and, hence, the ultimate path of the state's technocratic script. The net effect of the crisis affected, deeply, Kennedy's diplomacy toward the Soviets, making the 1963 test ban treaty possible. It also affected Lyndon Johnson's calculus of the Cold War. In that respect, the brief but traumatic encounter with nuclear war shadowed Johnson's gradualist approach to Vietnam. The managerial and technocratic script informed by the increasingly quantitative, analytical frameworks of the Pentagon and the National Security Council pulled Johnson and the United States into Vietnam, but with the hard constraints imposed for avoiding another nuclear confrontation. The missile crisis was embedded in the collective memory of the American public. It became an implicit factor in the operative ideologies of American decision-makers. It reminded Lyndon Johnson and everyone who worked on foreign policy that the price of the Cold War could be genuinely catastrophic. So, in the last analysis, the encounter with nuclear holocaust moved the center of the American orientation toward the Cold War and the Soviet Union very slightly to the left. The neo-Wilsonians and political realists gained something in the aftermath of Cuba, and the military in its totality lost.

Vietnam

The orthodox script, challenged by domestic social change, turned with the ugly war in Indochina. Like the genre horror movies of Alfred Hitchcock, or the episodes of the popular science fiction series *The Twilight Zone*, Vietnam tore at the heart of American society. Metaphorically, it tortured its television observers with endless morality plays set in the swamps of the Mekong Delta. Nonetheless, the intervention grew quickly in the

⁵⁰⁸Chris Bellamy, *Red God of War: Soviet Artillery and Rocket Forces* (London: Brassey's, 1986); Bluth, *Soviet Strategic Arms Policy before SALT*, 121–218; Lawrence Freedman, *U.S. Intelligence and the Soviet Strategic Threat* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986); Honore Marc Catudal, *Soviet Nuclear Strategy from Stalin to Gorbachev: A Revolution in Soviet Military and Political Thinking* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1989), 67–149; Donald P. Steury, ed., *Intentions and Capabilities: Estimates on Soviet Strategic Forces, 1950–1983* (Washington, DC: CIA, 1996); Steven J. Zaloga, *The Kremlin's Nuclear Sword: The Rise and Fall of Russia's Strategic Nuclear Forces, 1945–2000* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

mid-1960s, driven by the ideological prism of Cold War thought. Multiple perspectives on strategy were combined under the technocratic leadership of the Pentagon. The war was going to be long and costly, but the epistemologies of the Cold War, organized for global containment, saw the conflict as imperative. Even with intense discussions about the use of counterinsurgency and conventional forces, in the background was the larger schema of the Cold War. The nuclear crisis lay just underneath the surface as American leadership planned the defense of the free world in Southeast Asia. With each of several critical events, beginning with Diem's overthrow in 1963, the Gulf of Tonkin in 1965, and then the whole series of international and national events that defined the American war in Indochina, the script turned critically.⁵⁰⁹

The whole apparatus that supported the smooth projection of U.S. power around the world came under serious political assault. The age was so full of paroxysms of antiwar and anti-institutional protest that the political basis for maintaining the orthodox script shook under the weight of anger directed against it. By 1970, it was unclear if the American army was fit to fight, not only in Vietnam, but anywhere in the world.⁵¹⁰ Technologically, the military machine for war did not suffer—it advanced—but the script itself was at its nadir, based upon the memories of the Second World War, native anticommunism, and the fire of American nationalism. The institutional and epistemological basis for the national security state entered the Vietnam War intact. By its end, in the early 1970s, social and intellectual revolution had overcome the country. Vast new bodies of knowledge and political movements emerged, namely, feminism, ethnic rights and liberation (to be called cultural studies), and environmentalism; indeed, a wide-ranging democratic revolution had spread through American culture. The antitechnocratic, represented by the hippie movement but widespread in other American subcultures, presented a new culture. The national security structure would have to adapt. It would have to learn to fight wars with few casualties and subscribe to the powerful political movements that spread new forms of Wilsonianism in the United States and around the world.

The Intervention

The intervention in Vietnam had elements of cultural memory as well as the linear rationality of a technocratic decision-making system. On one level, the intervention was

⁵⁰⁹David Halberstam, *The Making of a Quagmire* (New York: Random House, 1965) and *The Best and the Brightest*; Schwab, *Defending the Free World*; Kaiser, *American Tragedy*, 341–497; Frederik Logevall, *Choosing War: The Lost Chance for Peace and the Escalation of War in Vietnam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 333–413.

⁵¹⁰Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties*, 376–78; Richard Boyle, *The Flower of the Dragon: The Breakdown of the U.S. Army in Vietnam* (San Francisco: Ramparts Press, 1972); Shelby L. Stanton, *The Rise and Fall of an American Army: U.S. Ground Forces in Vietnam, 1965–1973* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1985), 346–48; B. G. Burkett and Glenna Whitley, *Stolen Valor: How the Vietnam Generation Was Robbed of Its Heroes and Its History* (Dallas: Verity Press, 1998).

an engagement between the communist camp and the Western camp. It was a local conflict in the global ideological struggle between the two rivals for global order. On another level, the longest war in American history was an encounter between the advanced technological society of North America and the non-Western, undeveloped society and culture of Vietnam. The apposite axes of North-South and East-West conflicts converged in the encounter between the United States and the People's Republic of Vietnam. It was thoroughly scripted by the Cold War, by the history of America's expansion and redemptive mission, and by the clandestine struggle over two thousand years against foreign domination that was at the very center of Vietnamese historical identity. The conflict buried itself in the heart of American and Indochinese societies, turning the mechanisms of political, social, and intellectual revolution in those countries and around the world. It reorganized the American and Western scripts, changing the Cold War and the fundamental perspective of various elite groups on the nature of power, institutions, and social and political relationships on all levels of society.

The facts of the intervention are clear. The escalation of the Vietnam War came over a period of years. Sixteen thousand troops were in the country when John F. Kennedy died. By the summer of 1965 more than 50,000 were there, and by the end of the year close to 200,000 American personnel were deployed in South Vietnam. The high-water mark was in the spring of 1969, after Johnson's retirement and the new president, Richard Nixon, was ready to begin the long process of withdrawal. More than 500,000 troops were in Vietnam in 1968 and 1969, and some 750,000 were in the combat region. A historian can cite the figures and the litany of combat operations that composed the Vietnam War from 1965 to 1972, when the last troops were there. In the social history of the war on the American side, much has been written about the effect of the war on the common soldier—its disorienting and scarring impact upon millions of men.⁵¹¹

In world historical terms, though, the war was hardly different from so many others fought in the twentieth century and earlier. It was horrific in many respects, yet so were hundreds of wars that were fought in Europe, Asia, and, indeed, on every continent inhabited by humans. One of the distinguishing aspects of the conflict was its immersion in the electronic media of the 1960s and 1970s. It had an immediate and deep impact upon viewing audiences in the United States and around the world. The incessant nature of the conflict inflamed anti-American feelings throughout the world. The visual brutality of American counterinsurgency operations infuriated public opinion in Western Europe. Otherwise friendly constituencies began to oppose American foreign policy in a serious way. In the United States, the conflict's media portrayal by not unsympathetic journalists and television producers inspired the radicalization of elite college youth and the acerbic

⁵¹¹*Peter Goldman and Tony Fuller, Charlie Company: What Vietnam Did to Us (New York: William Morrow, 1982); Joel Oster Brende and Erwin Randolph Parson, Vietnam Veterans: The Road to Recovery (New York: Plenum Press, 1985); Jonathan Shay, Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Tyranny and the Undoing of Character (New York: Atheneum, 1994); Richard A. Kulka et al., Trauma and the Vietnam War Generation (New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1990).*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

rejection of the war by millions of committed liberals as well as conservatives and moderates along the political spectrum.⁵¹²

Within the American state, the rival interpretations of political realists, neo-Wilsonian idealists, technocrats, and Clausewitzian war hawks inspired a morose and conflicted understanding of the war. The Johnson and Nixon administrations had little success winning the war because of the indomitable clandestine military skills of the enemy. It was hardly possible—no matter how much firepower was assembled, no matter the degree of humanitarian or civilian aid and the training of hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese in modern military practices—that the communists would be defeated and driven out of their homeland. This was understood implicitly in the summer of 1965 when, at a series of deliberative conferences over a period of a week at the end of July, the final decisions on the scope of American escalation were made by Lyndon Johnson and his coterie of advisers affiliated with the National Security Council.

Johnson followed his script into Vietnam. Johnson biographers describe a man in deep conflict over his actions. All primary sources, including audiotapes from the White House, show a man agonized and regretful over his choice. Despite profound personal premonitions of disaster, Johnson ordered the introduction of combat troops in 1965. He gave eloquent speeches that expressed his genuine belief in fighting the Cold War. Nonetheless, his political and personal destruction seemed almost predestined. It was as if this man, born of modest circumstances in the hill country of south central Texas, with enormous ambition, energy, and skill, had worked his way to the exalted position of president of the United States. There, in a position of world historical importance, he used the formidable powers of the office and his own force of personality to wage a conflict scripted for the United States and Vietnam and for Lyndon Johnson himself. It was his mission, no doubt imprinted, programmed, and implanted in his life plan, to martyr himself. So was his path, and so was his portrayal in the media and in accounts by recent political historians. In presiding over the escalation of the Vietnam War, Lyndon Johnson attended his own public funeral. He saw his funerary rites in the burning fires of Saigon during the Tet offensive of 1968, when the Vietcong, themselves scripted for martyrdom, were slaughtered in an attempt to break the United States and the South Vietnamese national army (ARVN) in their defense of South Vietnam. The Vietcong were buried in the thousands, their ranks forever decimated by the massive nationwide offensive. Yet, in the aftermath, the political will of the United States was broken, and Lyndon Johnson knew he would forever be known for waging an aggressive technological war against defenseless peasants.⁵¹³

⁵¹²Gerard J. DeGroot, *A Noble Cause? America and the Vietnam War* (Essex, UK: Longman/Pearson Education, 2000); Thomas Powers, *Vietnam: The War at Home: Vietnam and the American People, 1964–1968* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1984); Caroline Page, *U.S. Official Propaganda during the Vietnam War, 1965–1973: The Limits of Persuasion* (New York: Leicester University Press, 1996), 106–47.

⁵¹³See Johnson's *White House tape transcriptions in Beschloss, Taking Charge and Reaching for Glory*; Robert Dallek, *Flawed Giant: Lyndon Johnson and His Times, 1961–1973* (New York:

Johnson and all of his advisers knew that the Vietnamese died in massive numbers. Yet, no matter how many were killed, there were always survivors or new patriots ready to mount a defense of the fatherland against the American invaders. It was an old story in Vietnamese history. What was new was for the United States to wage the same kind of counterinsurgency warfare it had waged in the Philippines in the first years of the twentieth century. Ho Chi Minh and his fellow leaders in the North could draw upon international communism as a source of strength and vital support. The strongest support, however, was part of the script the Vietnamese used to approach the world. The Vietnamese had defeated invading armies for two thousand years. It may have taken enormous amounts of time and energy to do so, but over centuries, each of the invaders had withdrawn from the country. The French had believed that Indochina should be theirs forever. Rebellions of Vietnamese against them prior to the Second World War were insignificant. Suddenly, the occupation of Indochina by the Japanese triggered new momentum for resistance. It made the Vietnamese realize that the French were not superior and godlike as they would have the Vietnamese believe.⁵¹⁴

In response to the French defeat in 1940, and then the Japanese defeat in 1945, the Vietnamese invoked spontaneous demands for independence from France. Since they had allowed themselves to be defeated by the Japanese, the French were no longer superior in Vietnamese eyes. Vietnamese nationalists saw that their time had come. It would not matter how much punishment both the French and Americans inflicted upon the Vietnamese population in the name of national security and the promotion of freedom and democracy. The Vietnamese script responded in historical fashion to the French, organizing the “clandestine resistance” that Douglas Pike cited in his famous government study of the guerrilla movement in Vietnam. During the French-Indochina War, 1946–1954, the Vietminh attacked the vastly better equipped French army with the intensity that popular resistance movements have marshaled throughout history. In no uncertain terms, the Vietnamese nationalist movement wanted to defeat the French at all costs, and so it did. The Vietnamese and French scripts in Indochina worked themselves out over eight years. Then, during the 1960s, the resistance inherent in the script for Vietnam met its counterpart in the script for the redeemer nation. Now the defeat of the French had

Oxford University Press, 1999), 364–71; Joseph A. Califano Jr., *The Triumph and Tragedy of Lyndon Johnson: The White House Years* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000). For the Tet offensive of 1968 and its seminal importance, see Peter Braestrup, *Big Story: How the American Press and Television Reported and Interpreted the Crisis of Tet 1968 in Vietnam and Washington*, 2 vols. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1977), 465–529; Marc Jason Gilbert and William Head, eds., *The Tet Offensive* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996).

⁵¹⁴Mark Philip Bradley, *Imagining Vietnam and America: The Making of Postcolonial Vietnam, 1919–1950* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 10–72. *Vietnamese nationalism/radicalism does predate the Second World War*; see Hue-Tam Ho Tai, *Radicalism and the Origins of the Vietnamese Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 171–257; David G. Marr, *Vietnamese Anti-colonialism, 1885–1925* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971); William J. Duiker, *The Communist Road to Power in Vietnam* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), 5–93.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

been replaced by the defeat of the Americans. Despite the horrific firepower thrown against them, and the destruction of villages and towns, the Vietnamese communists won. Using the traditions of Vietnamese secret resistance with the organizational and ideological underpinnings of warfare that they gained from the socialist camp, the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese fought a shrewd international political war and combined it with an indomitable will to sustain military operations against a superior enemy.⁵¹⁵

Each day and each week from the start of the escalation, the war played all around the world and in the living rooms of every American family who watched national television. It infuriated and, ultimately, radicalized enough students and professors at elite private and public colleges, and enough clergy and political leaders at all levels of government, that the war gained formidable political opposition by the late 1960s. So when the massive Tet offensive began in February 1968, the political objectives for the campaign were just as important as, or more so than, the military ones. When the offensive was over, and tens of thousands of Vietcong cadres lay dead, with the entire leadership in the South decimated in a failed military campaign, the political objectives had been won, boldly and decisively, not in Vietnam but in the United States. In March, Lyndon Johnson announced his retirement after the end of his term. He also ended the bombing of the North and requested peace negotiations to end the war. In the dramaturgy of the conflict, the first act was over, and Johnson, the victim or the villain, was now ready to sacrifice himself and fall on his sword in front of the audience.⁵¹⁶

Technocratic imperatives worked with Lyndon Johnson and his advisers as the war escalated and then halted after Tet. The war's escalation was measured, as the literature suggests. Pentagon planners, who subscribed to cold, complex "military-political scenarios," designed the gradualism for which some military strategists blame the Johnson administration's defeat. Costs versus rewards, terms used by behavioral psychologists when they discussed the experimental variables for manipulating behavior, were applied by social scientists to the air and ground war against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. It may have been frustrating to Johnson to read the same dismally dry reports on the state of the war from the managerial perspective of the Pentagon or his National Security Council staff. Yet, quick unambiguous victory over the communists was an objective that could not be met except by the extraordinary ideas of certain military officers.

⁵¹⁵Joseph Buttinger, *Vietnam: A Dragon Embattled*, 2 vols. (New York: Praeger, 1967); Douglas Pike, *Viet Cong: The Organization and Techniques of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press 1966), 1–56, 306–43; Robert K. Brigham, *Guerrilla Diplomacy: The NLF's Foreign Relations and the Viet Nam War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999).

⁵¹⁶Braestrup, *Big Story*, 504–7; Halberstam, *The Best and the Brightest*, 652–58; Carol Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker, eds., 1968: *The World Transformed* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 33–109; Don Oberdorfer, *Tet! The Turning Point in the Vietnam War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 238–327; Dallek, *Flawed Giant*, 502–30.

Tet and Cambodia: The Denouement

The 1968 Tet offensive began a cascade of events, domestic and international, that led the United States out of Vietnam with its armed forces in crisis and its political electorate angry and divided over international and national issues. Walter Cronkite's editorializing on the roof of the Saigon Hilton, as he watched the city's fires during the Tet combat, was one event that journalists and historians have viewed as a terminal act for the American war effort. If Walter Cronkite thought the war was senseless and not winnable, how then could middle America be asked to continue to support a conflict that risked the lives of its young men? Public opinion shifted immediately after Tet. Women, far more than men, had abandoned Lyndon Johnson. Now the whole country abandoned, or seemed to have abandoned, the South Vietnamese and the prospects for any satisfactory outcome to the war.⁵¹⁷

The final push for Johnson came with his "wise men's" meeting. The most distinguished elderly statesmen of American foreign policy, Dean Acheson, Robert Lovett, John McCloy, Omar Bradley, and others, refused to endorse Johnson's request to expand the war once again. The American commander, William Westmoreland, requested hundreds of thousands more troops, and military leaders in the United States saw no reason to abandon the country to the communists. Yet, the wise men refused this time to endorse Johnson's decisions. They saw the political and economic costs of the war and determined that the escalation had gone far enough. There was no purpose to it other than to jeopardize the American economy and the international prestige of the United States around the world.⁵¹⁸

In the midst of massive orchestrated military operations against an enemy that was ostensibly inferior in every possible respect, the decision to halt escalation was a puzzling one. How was it, with all this force, that the Vietnamese communists survived? Pentagon calculations showed that the North Vietnamese, based upon casualty rates, could carry on the war indefinitely, exhausting the United States and weakening its worldwide mission to contain communism's expansion.

Nixon

Nixon remains the quintessential tragicomic figure in twentieth-century American history. Although despised by a broad spectrum of critics from the left to the right, his undeniable accomplishments in foreign and domestic policy belie his end in the most serious political scandal of the century. In his script, Nixon rose to power, was defeated, then rose again, overcoming his political enemies and achieving global status and recognition as a statesman. Then his script carried him to the abyss. The age had damaged him. Like his predecessor Lyndon Johnson, the destruction of the sixties and the

⁵¹⁷Halberstam, *The Best and the Brightest*, 661; Oberdorfer, *Tet!*, 296–308; Braestrup, *Big Story*, 489–502.

⁵¹⁸Walter Isaacson, *The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made*: Acheson, Bohlen, Harriman, Kennan, Lovett, McCloy (Boston: Faber and Faber, 1986), 698–706.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Vietnam War took a personal toll. He allowed his paranoia, innate to his personality, to bring on his self-immolation. In the Watergate crisis of 1972–1974, Nixon symbolically ended not only his political career but also the era of the sixties. Kennedy had opened the sixties, challenging the country to return to the ideals of its progressive tradition. Then the Kennedy crises and his death by an assassin's bullet were yet another turn in the national script. Johnson brought the Great Society and the Vietnam War, bringing the sixties, as the vessel of the revisionist period of the Cold War, to full realization. Johnson's denouement and the tragic deaths of the other heroic figures, Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr., established the gothic dimensions of America's crisis in 1968. The year was a "crack in time." The counterculture and all the "movements," the antiwar movement and the violent African-American protest movement, were synchronous with a global crisis of order, from Paris to Prague, Mexico City, and Beijing. The youth rebellion against orthodoxy had reached high tide, from the Cultural Revolution in China to the student movements in Mexico, France, Prague, and the United States. American cities burned from race riots, while Mexican students were jailed and even executed. Soviet tanks crushed the Prague Spring, and Red Guards purged universities of "counterrevolutionaries." In American academic circles, entire literatures were being turned upside down by the new ideas of the left. Most of what happened in 1968 continued and, in the case of academics, accelerated through the coming Nixon administration and the 1970s. The world was split open in 1968, the theater of politics poured out into the streets, and Richard Nixon, paragon of the conservative Republican establishment, won the White House, despite the third-party candidacy of George Wallace.⁵¹⁹

In political terms, the election of Richard Nixon in 1968 was the antidote to the moral crisis that gripped the redeemer nation. Lost in Vietnam, containment shaking under the political weight of the war, Nixon organized the middle and the right along the American political spectrum and proceeded to run the Vietnam War as a manageable crisis. His military strategy was decidedly Clausewitzian, as shown in the Christmas bombing of 1972.⁵²⁰ Yet, his overall strategy was, like that of all his predecessors and successors, a

⁵¹⁹Reg Murphy, *The Southern Strategy* (New York: Scribner, 1971); Joe McGinniss, *The Selling of the President* (New York: Penguin Books, 1969); Herbert S. Parmet, *Richard Nixon and His America* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1990); Reeves, *President Nixon*; Gary Wills, *Nixon Agonistes: The Crisis of the Self-Made Man*, 434–517; Matthews, *Kennedy and Nixon*, 258–70; Stephen E. Ambrose, *Nixon*, 3 vols. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988–1991), 2:201–44.

⁵²⁰Kissinger, *White House Years*, 1406–70; William Bundy, *A Tangled Web: The Making of Foreign Policy in the Nixon Presidency* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998), 145–64, 361–63; William Shawcross, *Sideshow: Kissinger, Nixon, and the Destruction of Cambodia* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979), 280–89; Jeffrey Kimball, *Nixon's Vietnam War* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998), 258–63, 364–66; William Burr, ed., *The Kissinger Transcripts: The Top Secret Talks with Beijing and Moscow* (New York: Norton, 1998); Gregory D. Cleva, *Henry Kissinger and the American Approach to Foreign Policy* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1989); Larry Berman, *No Peace, No Honor: Nixon, Kissinger and Betrayal in Vietnam* (New

form of technocratic managerial internationalism. Nixon negotiated with North Vietnam. His secretary of state, Henry Kissinger, spent years trying to develop a diplomatic accord between the North and the South. As part of their global diplomatic strategy to end the intervention, Nixon and Kissinger invented *détente*. Boldly, they abandoned the orthodox script and sought to reach a new accommodation with the communist powers. Nixon went to China and then to the Soviet Union, once more defusing the Cold War like John F. Kennedy had begun to do.

Nixon was a Cold Warrior but he was also president in the revisionist period. When he went to China in 1972 to dine with Mao Zedong and Chou En-lai, he reflected the revisionist notion that old enemies were not necessarily enemies, and that the orthodox view of the Cold War had perhaps run its course. In opening China to the West, the unconventional became conventional. Perceptions and misperceptions in international relations, as political decision-making theory of the period surmised, prevented international actors from ending hostile relationships. Errant U.S. and Soviet views on Berlin and Cuba had nearly brought the world to an apocalypse, and Johnson's decision on Vietnam had nearly ruined both Indochina and the United States as functioning societies.

In rapprochement with China, America the redeemer, through Nixon, the apostle of Cold War orthodoxy, made part of the Cold War mute. From its position as a deadly enemy of the free world, China was normalized. This happened even though in nearly every respect the Chinese of 1972 were no different than the communist Chinese of 1965—or 1949, for that matter. Committed to Marxism-Leninism, the Chinese viewed the United States as a capitalist country on the road to socialism that could be a very useful ally against China's principal enemy, the Soviet Union. America remained central to the world in American eyes. To Americans before Nixon's twin trips to China and the Soviet Union in the year of Watergate, 1972, America was the modern Zion. Simultaneously, to the Chinese and to the Soviets, the redeemer nation remained capitalist and hence an imperial power opposed to the socialist development that Marx and Lenin had promised. To the Chinese, China would always be the center, no matter how advanced or brilliant the West was in the last centuries of the millennium. To the Russians as well, Russia would always be the center of gravity—the divine country descended from the Slavs and the dynasties of the eastern Roman Empire.

Of all American statesmen in the twentieth century, Henry Kissinger understood the historical scripts of major world actors more deeply than anyone. As a classic realist and student of nineteenth-century European diplomacy, he saw how the comparative cultural, political, and strategic frameworks that established the balance of power all fit together. Each country had a persona, a characteristic way of dealing with the external world that could be viewed as a recursive pattern over centuries if not millennia. The United States was impassioned by its Calvinist roots and its need to spread the word as well as power in all areas of the world. The Chinese, as Kissinger viewed them, had their own interests

York: Free Press, 2001), 207–20; Raymond L. Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1994), 279–94.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

connected to their relations with East Asia and Russia over many centuries. The Chinese had historic rivalries with all of their neighbors, which transcended the ideological divide between socialist and liberal systems. The Russians, too, who met that same presidential election year with Nixon and participated in the first strategic arms limitation talks (SALT I), had long established strategic rivalries and alliances in Europe, the Middle East, and East Asia.⁵²¹

In the view of Kissinger and Nixon, both of whom in their foreign policy orientations approximated conservative political realists, the Russians and the Chinese could be used to isolate and punish North Vietnam. From 1969 until nearly the end of the American ground war, the North Vietnamese remained defiant against the Nixon administration. They refused serious negotiation with the South Vietnamese, forcing the United States to continue its destructive war that inflicted damage not only on the Vietnamese and the other peoples of the region, but on the health and integrity of American society. As the North Vietnamese stalled in their peace negotiations in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the antiwar movement in the United States continued to radicalize. Large-scale protests closed major American universities; Michigan, Columbia, Berkeley, and Wisconsin, hotbeds of political activism, sponsored radical forums that not only closed the campuses but fomented active resistance to U.S. government policies. Throughout the country, ever widening political activism—not only in relation to foreign policy, but also in relation to civil rights for blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians—threatened the viability of major American institutions.

A major point of crisis was reached in the spring of 1970, when National Guard troops fired upon students at Kent State University, killing four of them. The students were taking part in nationwide demonstrations that expressed outrage at the incursion of American troops into Cambodia, threatening to widen the Vietnam conflict into the rain forests of yet another country. Nixon's response to the deaths was less than sympathetic. His antipathetic remarks served to strengthen world public opinion against him and his policy. The inability of an integrated technocratic strategy to win in Vietnam was reinforced by the political disasters connected to the antiwar movement, from the campus protests to the publication of the notorious Pentagon Papers.⁵²²

⁵²¹Kissinger, *White House Years*, 226–313, 1049–1123, 1301–1475, and *Years of Upheaval*, 3–44, 302–74; Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation*, 227–322; Thornton, *The Nixon-Kissinger Years*, 289–324.

⁵²²*DeBenedetti and Chatfield*, *An American Ordeal*, 238–311; *Anderson*, *The Movement and the Sixties*, 350–52; *Tom Wells*, *The War Within: America's Battle over Vietnam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 223–470; *Richard Stacewicz*, *Winter Soldiers: An Oral History of the Vietnam Veterans against the War* (New York: Prentice Hall International, 1997); *Nancy Zaroulis*, *Who Spoke Up? American Protest against the War in Vietnam, 1963–1975* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984); *Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones*, *Peace Now! American Society and the Ending of the Vietnam War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999).

In this context, at the higher level of statecraft, Nixon and Kissinger reoriented American foreign policy. Once more, the national script was modified to accommodate the dynamics of the Cold War.

Post-Vietnam

Once Kissinger had signed the Paris accords on behalf of the United States, the Vietnam War was over. It had gutted America's self-confidence and its worldwide image. The South Vietnamese were still considered allies. Contrary to some accounts, they were not abandoned by Nixon or Ford. Rather, when the North Vietnamese army attacked in the spring of 1975, American public opinion refused to respond. There was no public outcry for the defense of South Vietnam. After eight years of wrenching national crisis, the war could not be restarted under any foreseeable circumstances. Congress denied the two billion dollars in emergency aid that South Vietnam requested that spring. Despite its huge well-equipped army and air force, the Republic of Vietnam could not halt an invasion by a much smaller and less heavily armed North Vietnamese military force. With what looked like a predictable outcome, the communists attacked and threw back the republican forces. Though it defended its homeland, the ARVN dissolved under attack.

Vietnam "fell," or was "unified," depending upon one's point of view, in 1975. Cambodia and Laos fell to the communists almost simultaneously. In all three countries, hundreds of thousands of desperate refugees fled to the open seas or overland to Thailand. The anticommunist establishment gained some political weight from the refugee exodus. It confirmed the establishment's belief in the true nature of communist regimes, whether found in Europe or in the Third World. The evidence was more tragic with the gruesome genocide in Cambodia, which was evident as soon as the Khmer Rouge took over the capital, Phnom Penh. Newspaper and television reports of Nazi-scale atrocities triggered global fear. The voices in Congress and the American public that had so vociferously opposed intervention in Indochina fell silent.⁵²³

In the immediate aftermath of the Vietnam War, the world had become far more disordered and anti-American. In addition to the smug remarks of European intellectuals, the Third World, from Asia and Africa to the Americas, brimmed with crisis. The Middle East confronted Israel and the West in the Yom Kippur war. Having control over all its oil resources for the first time, the Arab world leveraged its economic power by raising the price of oil 2,000 percent in seven years. For a brief decade, until oil prices declined in the early 1980s, money and power shifted to the Arab states. Once more, anti-imperialist rhetoric against the United States was heightened around the world. The Soviets, taking advantage of perceived U.S. weakness, sent Cuban troops into Africa. Within a few years, Cuban troops were present in all the former colonies of Portugal as well as in Ethiopia. Marxism appeared strong in Africa, both in sub-Saharan and Saharan

⁵²³Henry Kissinger, *Years of Renewal* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999), 463–546; Shawcross, *Sideshow*, 365–92; Kim Depaul, ed., *Children of Cambodia's Killing Fields: Memoirs of Survivors* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

regions. There were anti-American regimes in Libya, Uganda, Ethiopia, Somalia, Angola, Mozambique, and elsewhere. Afghanistan and Iran blew up at the end of the 1970s. The Shah fell in 1978, and the hostage crisis ensued soon after. In Afghanistan, the Soviets effectively ended the revisionist Cold War in 1980. The approach of the Soviet armies toward Pakistan and the entrance to the Persian Gulf was the last nail in the coffin for the view that the Soviets were benign. Analysts at the CIA viewed the Soviet attack as defensive, but the political ramifications were clear.⁵²⁴

The revisionist Cold War remained but was in decline through the mid- and late 1970s. A new world confronted the redeemer nation. No longer was American power beyond dispute. Vietnam had proven that clearly. The Arab oil embargo reinforced the idea. The massive Soviet effort to obtain nuclear parity, and the relative decline of the American economy vis-à-vis Europe and Japan confirmed the revisionist consensus that America was not really the nation of destiny. It had somehow found its way in a complicated world and now had to come to terms with the idea that the globe was not black and white and that American power was indeed finite. Americans did not have all the power or the answers; this was agreed to by conservative political realists such as Kissinger, as well as by the large communities of policy scientists who addressed the world's problems in terms of structural limits on growth and prosperity. There were limits, according to social, physical, and natural scientists, to the amount of energy that the world could produce for its use. There was limited supply of cropland, food, water, minerals, metals, and other raw materials that sustained industrial economic systems.⁵²⁵

In a world of limits and relative decline, which was the prevailing view of the late 1970s, the United States had to reconsider its global mission. The nation did not have to redefine its essential script, which remained the country's communication of its culture to

⁵²⁴Walter F. Hahn, *Soviet Shadow over Africa* (Washington: Center for Advanced International Studies, University of Miami, 1976); R. Craig Nation and Mark V. Kauppi, eds., *The Soviet Impact in Africa* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1984); Vernon Aspaturian, Alexander Dallin, and Jiri Valenta, *The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan: Three Perspectives: Essays* (Los Angeles: Center for International and Strategic Affairs, University of California, Los Angeles, 1980); Anthony Arnold, *Afghanistan: The Soviet Invasion in Perspective* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1985); Henry S. Bradsher, *Afghan Communism and Soviet Intervention* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 75–95; Joseph J. Collins, *The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan: A Study in the Use of Force in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), 77–164.

⁵²⁵Peter Moll, *From Scarcity to Sustainability: Futures Studies and the Environment: The Role of the Club of Rome* (New York: P. Lang, 1991); Fred Hirsch, *Social Limits to Growth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976); Arthur S. Bougey, *Strategy for Survival: An Exploration of the Limits to Further Population and Industrial Growth* (Menlo Park, CA: W. A. Benjamin, 1976); Kenneth E. Boulding, Michael Kammen, and Seymour Martin Lipset, *From Abundance to Scarcity: Implications for the American Tradition* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1978); Donella H. Meadows, *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind* (New York: Universe Books, 1972); Rufus E. Miles Jr., *Awakening from the American Dream: The Social and Political Limits to Growth* (New York: Universe Books, 1976).

the world. Rather, it needed to consider the overall scheme for dealing with power and economics in the international system. It was in this context that James Earl Carter approached the presidency in the late 1970s, and the way he left it four years later.

The Carter Presidency

In most respects, Jimmy Carter was a failed president. He achieved diplomatic triumphs with the Camp David Accords of 1978 and the Panama Canal treaty of 1979, but his country's economy and the stability of the international environment appeared to collapse on him in the last year of his four-year term. Unprecedented inflation and the decline of American industry, combined with the Iranian hostage crisis and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, managed to turn him into a semitragic transitional figure. The basic systems of the liberal technocratic order and the liberal technocratic national security state maintained themselves, even in the face of war, instability, and the relative weakening of American power within the international system. Yet, the country had no tolerance for decline. The redeemer nation had to follow its path of world enlightenment, and the diminution of America's industrial, military, and scientific strengths militated against the national script for expansion and integration of the world system.

Kennedy was the transitional figure from the orthodox to the revisionist period. Carter was the guide out of revisionism and into the last phase of the Cold War and the first phase of the post-Cold War era, the neo-orthodox. Carter inherited a world no longer observant of the preponderance of American power. Around the world, revolutionary forces armed in the rain forests, mountains, wastelands, and the urban ghettos of cities.. The technocratic ethos had run its course in the 1960s and 1970s. By the late 1970s, the apotheosis of man through technology was not apparent. On the contrary, the period was high tide for the antitechnocratic in global politics and policy planning. The technocratic paradigm that had armed a generation of postwar planners had done well until the early 1970s. Then the mechanisms for sustaining economic development fell afoul of the OPEC cartel and the newly powerful ecological movement. The critiques of global capitalism had peaked in the late 1960s and early 1970s as well. However, by the time Carter took office, the combined legacies of Vietnam and the post-Vietnam morass in the Middle East and elsewhere left the progressive new American president at deep risk. His nation's economy was fragile, and so was his foreign policy. These two overarching problems worked together. Within just a few years, the combination of oil shock in the Middle East and the Iranian hostage crisis drove the quiet Georgian from office, an abject failure.⁵²⁶

⁵²⁶Robert A. Strong, *Working in the World: Jimmy Carter and the Making of American Foreign Policy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 233–59; Robert A. Pastor, *Not Condemned to Repetition: The United States and Nicaragua* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2002); William H. Gleysteen Jr., *Massive Entanglement, Marginal Influence: Carter and Korea in Crisis* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999); Gerry Argyris Andrianopoulos, Kissinger and Brzezinski: The NSC and the Struggle for Control of U.S. National Security Policy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 100–21, 178–214; Gabriella Grasselli, *British and American Responses to*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Carter faced the world as an heir to the worldview of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, and John F. Kennedy. He accepted the Cold War doctrine of containment, but his neo-Wilsonian principles pushed him to revive the progressive ideals of the globalization of human rights and democracy. He wanted to negotiate with the Soviets and end the arms race. In the Third World he wanted a new understanding of human rights to emanate from American foreign policy. Right-wing regimes supported by the United States for decades, openly and covertly, shamed Carter and the liberal wing of his political party. It was inconsistent with American values that the United States government was funding torture, political repression, and atrocities against civilian populations as part of its treaty obligations. Yet, in his four years in office, Carter found the world splitting away from the United States. Central America exploded into civil war, with right-wing death squads moving against communist insurgencies in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. In Africa, increasing numbers of Cuban and Soviet advisers and troops bolstered the nascent Marxist regimes spreading across the sub-Saharan region. In the Middle East, Islamic revolution turned Iran into a bulwark of violent anti-Americanism. In Afghanistan, covert actions by the Carter administration prompted the Soviet invasion of 1980.⁵²⁷ The huge OPEC price increases pushed the American economy into a period of “stagflation,” with rising unemployment, low growth, and high inflation. By the end of Carter’s presidency, the international system and American foreign policy looked like they were in grave crisis. The ongoing expansion of Soviet nuclear weapons and the relative decline in American military readiness and technology presented Carter’s critics with an easy argument for a failed presidency.

The nature of Carter’s failure ushered in a new turn of the script. The revisionist phase of the Cold War that had begun in earnest in the mid-1960s came to an abrupt end by the late 1970s. The worsening position of the United States, in terms of its national prestige and relative economic and strategic power in the international system, ended the dominant liberal discourse on the Cold War that had cracked open in the late 1960s, as

the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan (*Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth, 1996*), 120–85; William B. Quandt, *Camp David: Peacemaking and Politics* (*Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1986*); David Patrick Houghton, *U.S. Foreign Policy and the Iran Hostage Crisis* (*New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001*); Mark Joseph Gasiorowski, *U.S. Foreign Policy and the Shah: Building a Client State in Iran* (*Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991*), 197–222; David W. Lesch, 1979: *The Year That Shaped the Modern Middle East* (*Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001*), 19–57; Brzezinski, *Power and Principle*, 318–98, 470–509.

⁵²⁷Interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski, in *Le Nouvel Observateur* (*France*), January 15–21, 1998, p. 76. In reply to the interviewer’s question if he regretted U.S. covert actions that induced Soviet intervention in 1979, Brzezinski replied:

Regret what? That secret operation was an excellent idea. It had the effect of drawing the Russians into the Afghan trap and you want me to regret it? The day that the Soviets officially crossed the border, I wrote to President Carter: We now have the opportunity of giving to the USSR its Vietnam war. Indeed, for almost 10 years, Moscow had to carry on a war unsupported by the government, a conflict that brought about the demoralization and finally the breakup of the Soviet empire.

Johnson and then Nixon confronted the crises of Cold War orthodoxy. The revisionist framework, the revised script for the U.S.-Soviet rivalry, was toppled with the Iranian revolution and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The nuclear and conventional force structures to contain the Soviet Union, and the general view of Soviet intentions vis-à-vis the Cold War, swept the neo-Wilsonian ideas of détente off the table. With the election of Ronald Reagan, and his coterie of conservative foreign policy zealots, orthodoxy was born again.

The New Script: Technocratic Development in the Revisionist Cold War

There were two aspects to intellectual technology during the revisionist phase of the Cold War. In the social sciences and in the humanities, the impact of the sixties was transforming. The radical movement in academic culture literally redefined the study of history, much of the social sciences, and all of the humanistic disciplines. From the late 1960s on toward the end of the Cold War and afterward, the center of gravity in most fields changed. The old “white male” academic course was critiqued from the perspectives of race and gender. The technocratic ethos that defined corporate American culture was also exposed in its academic guises of national security culture, business administration, and corporate law. The radical critique held in many fields, conquering anthropology, sociology, and literature. By the 1980s and 1990s, women’s and ethnic studies programs were the norm on college campuses in the United States. The consensus culture was destroyed and a new polymorphic, but decidedly left, academic culture took its place.⁵²⁸

The revisionist Cold War began an intellectual revolution in American social science and humanities. During the revisionist phase, the radicalism of the antiwar movement of the sixties galvanized the radical rethinking of social knowledge, including the nature of the Cold War as a conflict. From the mid-1960s to the end of the 1970s, the academic script called for a standard rejection of the conventional and the orthodox. The measure of communist systems was no longer simply totalitarianism. Rather, communism was

⁵²⁸Sally L. Kitch, *Higher Ground: From Utopianism to Realism in American Feminist Thought and Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Miriam Schneir, ed., *The Vintage Book of Feminism: The Essential Writings of the Contemporary Women’s Movement* (London: Vintage, 1995); Patricia Ticineto Clough, *Feminist Thought: Desire, Power, and Academic Discourse* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994); Stacey Young, *Changing the Wor(l)d: Discourse, Politics, and the Feminist Movement* (New York: Routledge, 1997); James A. Banks, *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975); George Yancy, ed., *Cornel West: A Critical Reader* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001); Richard Delgado, ed., *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995); John McCormick, *The Global Environmental Movement* (New York: Wiley, 1995), 84–129; Robert J. Brulle, *Agency, Democracy, and Nature: The U.S. Environmental Movement from a Critical Theory Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000); Lisa M. Benton and John Rennie Short, eds., *Environmental Discourse and Practice: A Reader* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

viewed as, distinctly, a political system connected to particular national cultures. There was no international communist movement, at least according to the revisionists. The Soviets were not entirely totalitarian, nor was there clear evidence that Stalin had ever wanted to dominate the world. Rather, the revisionists argued that the Soviets' behavior was defensive. Soviet studies were divided between traditional historians and political scientists who were not swayed by the new arguments, and newer scholars who saw the world in terms of the sixties' script.⁵²⁹

The same division between orthodox and revisionist Cold War scholarship emerged in area studies. The Latin Americanists now subscribed to dependency theory and world systems theory to explain underdevelopment in the Americas. The revisionist critique, almost coterminous with theories of imperialism, was ascendant in Middle Eastern and African studies as well. In Asian studies, the American presence in Southeast and Northeast Asia was readily viewed in terms of global corporate interests and the ethnocentric strategic realism of the foreign policy establishment. Naturally, democracy and the Wilsonian mission were viewed in revisionist terms as a chimera. There was little or no interest in democracy in American Cold War foreign policy, so the argument went. Woodrow Wilson himself only wanted "democracy" as a tool to prevent the triumph of genuine revolutionary forces that threatened world capitalism.

Revisionist views of the Cold War understood the United States as an aggressive and mercenary presence in the world. The domination of powerful corporate interests resulted in a perversion of genuine liberal democratic sentiments that might exist in the redeemer nation. According to the revisionist ideology, the script for the redeemer nation called for the United States to expand doggedly and, if necessary, with utmost ruthlessness. The spread of democracy had nothing to do with the spread of American corporate institutions and culture, to the detriment of indigenous peoples and the aspirations of large working classes around the world. Having found sin in the redeemer nation, revisionists believed the solutions to those failures were somewhat obvious. In a Calvinist culture, as we have seen, the way of redemption is to do good works. According to the revisionist mindset, the tough, brutal, and insidious military infrastructure that laid waste to Indochina had to be reformed. The global defense machine, which was the Pentagon, would have to be dismantled. Large corporate giants, when not manufacturing weapons systems and

⁵²⁹*The most prominent new Soviet scholars in the 1970s viewed the Soviet Union and its history as merely another industrializing society in the twentieth century, based on the ideological heritage of Russian authoritarianism and Marxism-Leninism. The implications for Cold War foreign policy were generally a rejection of the orthodox image of a dangerous Marxist state. See Jerry F. Hough, The Soviet Union and Social Science Theory (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977) and How the Soviet Union Is Governed (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), along with his earlier monograph, The Soviet Prefects: The Local Party Organs in Industrial Decision-Making (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969). See also Stephen F. Cohen, Sovieticus: American Perceptions and Soviet Realities (New York: Norton, 1986) and Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History since 1917 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Sheila Fitzpatrick, Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union, 1921–1934 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979).*

polluting the oceans and the skies, had to be nationalized or, in fact, reconstituted. The “greens,” who gained influence in the 1990s, based their ideas on the writings of Noam Chomsky, Ralph Nader, Richard Falk, Kenneth Boulding, John Kenneth Galbraith, and Michael Harrington, among others.⁵³⁰

To be sure, the revisionist concept of the Cold War was not one camp or one view. Revisionist interpretations ran along a continuum. To a lesser degree, the orthodox view of the Cold War did the same. In both camps, the moderate interpretations gravitated toward the political reality of the dominant institutions in American politics. The New York Times, the Brookings Institution, and the liberal wing of Congress had their moderate revisionist interpretation of foreign policy and American society in general. From the radical perspective, these moderates were mere puppets of the regime. They had no true voice but to parrot and rationalize the Cold War orthodoxy of the technocratic elites. All of the issues that were contained in the radical left critique, in effect the very basis of the worldwide liberal order, were compromised by the compromisers. Could the New York Times, the epitome of the liberal establishment, ever see the world as the true believers did? From the radical point of view, which coincided nicely with the dominant view among left-wing intellectuals in Western Europe, the situation was hopeless indeed.

It would be inaccurate, however, to view the revisionist period as the death of orthodox or conservative interpretations of the contemporary period. The orthodox culture had not died; it had merely become dormant. From the post-Vietnam era through the end of the century, capitalist and technocratic ideologies returned to currency on college campuses. Business and law schools churned out the professional elites that managed public and private sector institutions in the United States. The national security culture, chastened during the war, reasserted itself. By the early 1980s, the return of orthodoxy converted national security policy into a dynamic, cutting-edge field. At certain elite universities, the subject became a trendy major among a subgroup of political science students.⁵³¹

⁵³⁰See Richard Falk, *This Endangered Planet: Prospects and Proposals for Human Survival* (New York: Random House, 1971); Noam Chomsky, *For Reasons of State* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973); Ralph Nader, *The Rape of the Powerless: A Symposium at the Atlanta University Center* (New York: Gordon and Breach, 1971); Kenneth Boulding, *A Primer on Social Dynamics: History as Dialectics and Development* (New York: Free Press, 1970); John Kenneth Galbraith, *Economics and the Public Purpose* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973); Michael Harrington, *Decade of Decision: The Crisis of the American System* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980).

⁵³¹Thomas C. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960); Mervyn Frost, *Towards a Normative Theory of International Relations* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Gil Friedman and Harvey Starr, *Agency, Structure, and International Politics: From Ontology to Empirical Enquiry* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Steve Weber, *Cooperation and Discord in U.S.-Soviet Arms Control* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991); Paul Weirich, *Equilibrium and Rationality: Game Theory Revised by Decision Rules* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Martin Shubik, *A Game-Theoretic Approach to Political Economy*, vol. 2 of *Game Theory in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984); Drew Fudenberg and Jean Tirole, *Game Theory* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991);

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The physical science and engineering disciplines of the revisionist period did not succumb to the tidal wave of antiestablishment sentiment. In the mathematical and technocratic universe of physicists, chemists, engineers, and mathematicians, the left had far less impact either socially or epistemologically. In a sense, among most of these “hard” scientists, the political divisions of the revisionist period, and in fact, of the Cold War era in total, were of tangential interest. The innovations of the 1960s and 1970s were connected to the long-term research patterns of scientists working in a wide range of theoretical and applied fields. While the political universe debated Vietnam, Third World nationalism, and the state of race relations, gender, and class in the United States, physical scientists continued their work. They maintained the same schedule for their experiments and designs that showed clear continuity with their own work over decades and the work of their predecessors far back into the nineteenth century. Pondering the state of the physical universe, including the increasingly small quantum particles that were being studied in the huge atomic accelerators built for the purpose, these scientists were on an entirely different path than the humanists, the social scientists, and the activists who dominated academic culture.⁵³²

The scientists and engineers, valued implicitly for their high IQs and the work they did on major technological achievements, worked deliberately, pondering the future of the human race and the nature of their disciplines. These brilliant thinkers, with ideas that would define the technocratic realm of the twenty-first century, published their preliminary works. Nanotechnology emerged during the revisionist era in the mind of Eric Drexler, a seminal theorist on the subject. In computer science, new generations of software were developed as each new wave of computer machines was deemed behind the times and replaced. Molecular electronics, molecular biology, and, indeed, most of the ideas that became known as high-tech in later decades, were born during the height of the Cold War, when angry political dialogue and Cold War international tensions rose repeatedly toward the breaking point.⁵³³

Reinhard Selten, *Game Equilibrium Models*, 4 vols. (New York: Springer, 1991); *Richard A. Posner*, *Tort Law: Cases and Economic Analysis* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1982); *Richard A. Posner and Francesco Parisi*, eds., *Law and Economics*, 3 vols. (Lyme, NH: Elgar, 1997).

⁵³²*Albert H. Teich*, ed., *Scientists and Public Affairs* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1974); *Thomas J. Kuehn and Alan L. Porter*, eds., *Science, Technology, and National Policy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981); *Stephen Hilgartner*, *Science on Stage: Expert Advice as Public Drama* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000); *Daniel S. Greenberg*, *The Politics of Pure Science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); *Ralph E. Lapp*, *The New Priesthood: The Scientific Elite and the Uses of Power* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965); *U.S. House*, *The National Science Board: Science Policy and Management for the National Science Foundation, 1968–1980* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1983); *Alfred K. Mann*, *For Better or for Worse: The Marriage of Science and Government in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); *Graham and Diamond*, *The Rise of American Research Universities*.

⁵³³*Eric Drexler*, *Engines of Creation* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1986); *Rietman*, *Molecular Engineering of Nanosystems*; *Roco and Bainbridge*, *Societal Implications of*

The New Culture

The Vietnam War and the black civil rights movement peeled open American society like an onion. The wholesale challenge to institutional authority unleashed cultural forces beyond prediction. As a societal framework, orthodox Cold War culture collapsed in the 1960s. The new authorities of the counterculture and the new intellectual movements of the New Left threw the old paradigms for social, cultural, and political norms off the throne. The traditional or “conventional” ways of Eisenhower’s America had white shirts, dark ties, and short hair for men and long voluminous dresses for women. The conservative script for postwar corporate culture included segregated neighborhoods, cocktail bars for libertines, and Bible colleges for the devout. With the new script of Vietnam and Watts, the anti-Cold War, or counterscript, of the 1960s and 1970s transformed not only social norms but the entire intellectual framework for American and, ultimately, Western academic culture.⁵³⁴

The destruction of the old script made modern feminism, as an intellectual, political, and cultural movement, possible. The tight, repressive, gendered world of the early Cold War and, indeed, of all historical periods prior to that, was dismantled in the intellectual space that radical thought acquired in American society during the late 1960s. The same space engendered an ecology movement that spread in all directions, manifesting not only a radical anticorporatist ideology, but also a renewal of the conservative progressive environmentalism advanced by Theodore Roosevelt in the late nineteenth century. The New Left found new space for gender, ecology, and class analysis of American society. It was a fragile space, opened in the wake of a horrific national trauma, but it was enough of an opening to produce an enduring legacy of radical thought, for both elite and mass consumption. The new culture challenged the very nature of the Cold War and the capitalist system that was connected to it. American discourse, for the first time in more than a generation, included a critical view of capitalism as an economic system that generated new wealth through sophisticated international means of exploitation. As American troops dug in under the forest canopies in the Vietnamese countryside, laying waste to villages, forests, and swampland, all in the defense of American containment objectives, the fabric of political, social, and cultural consensus unwound. The new narrative, angry and hopeless in the face of an insupportable war, mirrored the opposite of everything in the older culture.

By 1980, the interlocking domestic and international crises that afflicted the last years of the Carter presidency showed the American paradigm at almost its nadir. The global system—economic, political, social, and strategic—appeared to have unraveled to a

Nanoscience and Nanotechnology; J. Jortner and M. Ratner, eds., *Molecular Electronics: A “Chemistry for the 21st Century” Monograph* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Science, 1997).

⁵³⁴Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969); Marcy Darnovsky, *Barbara Epstein, and Richard Flacks, eds., Cultural Politics and Social Movements* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995); Bloom, *Long Time Gone*.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

degree never seen since the beginning of the Cold War. It was as if the United States had lost its leadership in all spheres, from manufacturing to capital development, to strategic weapons, to moral leadership in the West. By 1980 the culture had changed significantly from where it had been when Kennedy ushered in the “new frontier” in 1961. Youthful idealism had been replaced by fatigue and defeatism. No longer could Americans rely upon secure supplies of energy or the integrity and order of their large cities. The controlled culture of the early Cold War was gone. No longer did American society produce millions of school children in uniforms or conservative dress. No longer was America a country where almost all institutions, including marriage, religion, schools, the business system, and the government, were considered good and reliable.⁵³⁵

Epistemologically, the 1960s and 1970s were extremely productive. The innovations in mathematics of the 1940s and 1950s, including information theory and game theory, were expanded in the age of space exploration and nuclear forces. Microelectronics, a result of the development of the semiconductor, began to transform the new fields of computer science and cybernetics. Mathematical knowledge and methods became the standards in economics and some fields of political science. The investments in intellectual technology by military institutions during the wars of the twentieth century bore fruit.⁵³⁶ Vast new fields of quantitative- and nonquantitative-based knowledge developed and blossomed as a consequence of the large-scale institution building begun earlier in the century. A new generation of scholars contributed to the ever widening and dynamic expanse of technocratic as well as nontechnocratic thought. With the introduction of widespread data processing, the quantitative disciplines grew more quantitative. Complex algorithms were developed to describe psychological, economic, political, and social behaviors. The same trends occurred in the administrative sciences, in business, and in public policy, as well as in the physical and natural sciences. Ironically, even as a revolution commenced, in the entire realm of academia, that rejected the orthodox disciplines and their epistemologies, the technocratic construction of the world continued apace. The antitechnocratic theses of Marxists, feminists, and other humanist scholars and activists were both accepted and ignored. By the 1980s, gender studies would be incorporated into the academic curricula of major universities, but so would the large-scale positivistic approaches of quantifiers in political science, sociology, and other disciplines.⁵³⁷

⁵³⁵Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties*, 355–423.

⁵³⁶Tom Forester, ed., *The Microelectronics Revolution: The Complete Guide to the New Technology and Its Impact on Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980); Robert Irvine Smith and Bob Campbell, *Information Technology Revolution* (New York: Longman, 1981); Dirk Hanson, *The New Alchemists: Silicon Valley and the Microelectronics Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1982); Hans Queisser, *The Conquest of the Microchip* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).

⁵³⁷Susan Hardy Aiken, ed., *Changing Our Minds: Feminist Transformations of Knowledge* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988); Bell Hooks, *Feminist Theory from Margin to Center* (Boston: South End Press, 1984); Susan Hardy, *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues* (Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press, 1986); John H. Mueller, Karl F.

The counterepistemologies of the 1960s were essential to the revisionist Cold War. In the wake of the anger that tore at the country, with universities and city blocks burning and the country full of millions of activists demanding change, the revolt of intellectuals came in earnest. It began slowly in the 1950s, as critical work was done challenging the “power elite,” in C. Wright Mills’s phrase, or the corporate state as understood by William Appelman Williams at Wisconsin. Stanley Elkins’s attack on the proslavery literature of modern Southern historians began in the 1950s, and other thinkers from the academic left slowly began to make headway against the prevailing orthodoxy. Then the exiled Frankfurt school, including Herbert Marcuse, challenged the sanctimonious nature of postwar American society. One-Dimensional Man, a radical critique of Western civilization, appeared in 1964. From the mid-1960s, the flood of avant-garde literature became the dominant paradigm in the humanities.⁵³⁸

The radical thought of the “sixties” continued to develop in the seventies and eighties, as it became more the norm in academic circles, rather than the exception. The revisionist Cold War was at its apogee, when radical left scholars critiqued every aspect of American society, from Chomsky’s attack on American imperialism, to the whole corpus of feminist writings that began in the late 1960s. In the age of Vietnam, with passions running high at the major college campuses, the American counterscript caused academic knowledge to produce a generation of Marxist and radical left scholars. Rejecting the progressive thesis in American history, Parsonian sociology, neo-Freudian psychology, Keynesian economics, and the modernization paradigm in all of the social sciences, radicals began to reconstruct all aspects of academic knowledge related to the United States, its history, and its social and political systems. New feminist scholars, who dissected the nature of the family and male patriarchy, challenged the foundations of American society, intellectually as well as culturally and socially.⁵³⁹ The critique of

Schuessler, and Herbert L. Costner, *Statistical Reasoning in Sociology* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970); Gordon Tullock, *Toward a Mathematics of Politics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967); Hayward R. Alker Jr., *Mathematics and Politics* (New York: Macmillan, 1965); William H. Riker and Peter C. Ordeshook, *An Introduction to Positive Political Theory* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973); Laurence D. Smith and William R. Woodward, eds., *B. F. Skinner and Behaviorism in American Culture* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1996); Laurence D. Smith, *Behaviorism and Logical Positivism: A Reassessment of the Alliance* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1986); John A. Mills, *Control: A History of Behavioral Psychology* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

⁵³⁸Stanley Elkins, *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1959); William Appelman Williams, *The Roots of the Modern American Empire: A Study of the Growth and Shaping of Social Consciousness in a Marketplace Society* (New York: Random House, 1969); Mills, *The Power Elite*; Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).

⁵³⁹Chomsky, *American Power and the New Mandarins*, 309–59, and *At War with Asia* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970); Sandy Vogelgesang, *The Long Dark Night of the Soul: The American Intellectual Left and the Vietnam War* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974); Robert R. Tomes, *Apocalypse Then: American Intellectuals and the Vietnam War, 1954–1975* (New York:

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

corporate capitalism, which had a long tradition in American political thought, was expanded by the neo-Marxist ideas imported from European and Latin American universities. What became known as the “world systems” approach to world history was adopted from France’s postwar Marxists, who mixed phenomenology with historical materialism.⁵⁴⁰ Critical anthropological and sociological approaches juxtaposed Western technocratic capitalism with Third World cultures that showed evidence of gross damage and destruction by Western acculturation. The encounter with the West, viewed as positive by American scholars prior to the 1960s, came to be seen more as an invitation to cultural loss and degradation. In both American inner cities and in remote villages on other continents, anthropologists documented the despair of American life. Sociologists wrote about the damage that the Cold War and modern life had inflicted on American culture. America was “at the breaking point,” at least according to one California sociologist in 1970.⁵⁴¹ A huge and complex society found itself past mid-century in a duel with Southeast Asian peasants and their far more powerful allies. Yet, presidents did not want to fight wars. Nor could they suppress the rebellions in American cities, on college campuses, and by the sophisticated rhetoric and activism of professional leftists who challenged America on every ground.

The maxim of the period delegitimated every aspect of contemporary American society. Ultimately, the dethronement of social and political order resulted in a truly relativist world. There was nothing sacred in the revisionist Cold War. There were no real unblemished heroes, only antiheroes of a sort. Cinematic criticism from the period extolled the likes of Dustin Hoffman, who played mildly antiestablishment roles in such films as *Little Big Man* and *The Graduate*, and Robert Redford and Paul Newman, the antiheroes in *Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid*. Hoffman and others were a fitting transition from the epitome of heroic American manhood portrayed by John Wayne and Charlton Heston, among others. Other films, notably *Easy Rider*; *Midnight Cowboy*; *Paris, Texas*; and *Carnal Knowledge*, redefined cinema for the sixties revolution and the revisionist Cold War.⁵⁴² The literature on the subject is clear. The cultural ramifications

New York University Press, 1998); Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Carol C. Gould and Marx W. Wartofsky, eds., *Women and Philosophy: Toward a Theory of Liberation* (New York: Putnam, 1976).

⁵⁴⁰Immanuel Wallerstein, ed., *World Inequality: Origins and Perspectives on the World System* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1975) and *The Modern World-System*; Alan Megill, *Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985); James Miller, *The Passion of Michel Foucault* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000); Pamela Major-Poetzl, *Michel Foucault’s Archaeology of Western Culture: Toward a New Science of History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983).

⁵⁴¹Slater, *The Pursuit of Loneliness*, 29–52.

⁵⁴²Stephen Powers, David J. Rothman, and Stanley Rothman, *Hollywood’s America: Social and Political Themes in Motion Pictures* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996); Norman K. Denzin, *Images of Postmodern Society: Social Theory and Contemporary Cinema* (London: Sage, 1991); William J. Palmer, *The Films of the Seventies: A Social History* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press,

of the Vietnam War transformed popular and bohemian culture and forced the society to reexamine itself. In the long run, what began in the sixties as a cultural revolt against the antiseptic, conformist age of the fifties gradually became a thorough undermining of social norms. The movies that shocked in the sixties did not shock in the seventies. Then, in the eighties and the nineties, another generation, whose frame of reference began with the sixties, went beyond the early counterculture in the use of sex and violence. The anomie of the Vietnam era became the foundation for increasing levels of anomic relativism that ideological conservatives would attribute all social evils to. From the cultural space that came out of the sixties, the variegated late-twentieth-century cultural ethos of the West emerged.

The postmodern cultural ethos, engendered by the revisionist age, had a similar or complementary impact on progressive politics. In the wake of the revolution, the world needed to understand the nature of the new environmental movement. Seemingly overnight, the ecological movement in American society was founded. It worked with a desperate air to save the earth from human beings and their destruction. As mass antiwar protests mounted in Washington, D.C., and college campuses everywhere, the institutional legitimacy of everything was open to challenge. The questioning included everything from the nature of the American family to that of sexuality, American nationality, and the ownership of industry. When the brutality of the Vietnam War entered the intimacy of the American family's living room, the consequences became extreme. The technocratic script for the ordered, scientific apotheosis of American civilization in the ensuing decades and centuries was replaced by thicker, more complex and tragic versions of the future. Stanley Kubrick's *A Clockwork Orange* intimated one version of the near future in which the police state and technology would rule. Over ensuing decades, Kubrick's vision was to be replicated many times—its futuristic brutality and sinister representation of human nature became the new Hobbesian paradigm for Anglo-American culture.⁵⁴³

Toward the Reagan Revolution

The instability experienced in the age of the revisionist Cold War, and its intimation of American decline, eventually led to its counterscript. Ronald Reagan, who was viewed in toto by all revisionists, political and cultural, with scorn and condescension, rose during the revisionist Cold War to first the statehouse in California and later the presidency. In the revisionist script, Reagan was an irritant. He was a crude reactionary who hoped for a return to the outmoded world of the mid-twentieth century. In the 1970s, the orthodox Cold Warrior, resolute in his anticommunism and his devotion to corporate capitalism and to the privileges of conservative elites around the world, began to organize

1987); Peter Lev, *American Films of the '70s: Conflicting Visions* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000).

⁵⁴³Mario Falsetto, ed., *Perspectives on Stanley Kubrick* (New York: G. K. Hall, 1996); Luis M. Garcia Mainer, *Narrative and Stylistic Patterns in the Films of Stanley Kubrick* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 1999).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

the political right once again. He aspired to overthrow the liberal internationalist creed of both the Democrats and the centrist wing of the Republicans. Yet, before he could accomplish what he wanted, he needed the revisionist script to run its course.

Antecedents: American Decline

During the 1970s, it was easy to see America as in a state of decline. The prism for American power showed clearly that the country's fortunes had moved downward instead of upward. No longer, in the wake of American defeat in Vietnam, was the American military invincible. Rather, what observers saw in the 1970s was a series of political setbacks for the American superpower. The fall of Vietnam was coterminous with the Arab oil embargo and the Watergate crisis. In the mid-1970s, Soviet regimes took power in the former Portuguese possessions in Africa, as well as in Somalia and Ethiopia. In the Middle East, Soviet power included client states in Syria and Iraq, and at the end of the decade, an Afghan regime allied with the Soviets seized power in Kabul. Finally, the Iranian hostage crisis, which engulfed the country through the first year of the 1980s, demonstrated the impotence of a superpower in the face of anger and terrorism.

In Vietnam, of course, the deadly application of military force eventually brought the North Vietnamese to concede at the Paris peace table, but in the end, American stipulations to ensure the survival of South Vietnam were dismissed. After the trauma of Watergate shamed the country and decreased the strength of the presidency as an institution, the North Vietnamese army rolled south into Saigon in the spring of 1975. There was nothing for the redeemer nation to do now, after hundreds of thousands of American and millions of Vietnamese casualties. The final loss of Vietnam and the destruction of Cambodia by the Khmer Rouge were more salt in the national wound. The spectacle of hundreds of thousands of refugees, desperate for escape, pouring out of Indochina vindicated the conservatives who had supported the war for a decade. The imposition of an orthodox Soviet-style regime in South Vietnam and the genocidal madness of Cambodia contributed to end the revisionist Cold War.⁵⁴⁴ The left in American politics, for a while in the early 1970s, argued that communism in Southeast Asia might not be "a bad thing." It was believed, albeit naively, that the differences between corrupt right-wing government and socialist government in the region were not material, and that the communists would produce reforms that the authoritarian South Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian generals would never be able to. With the refugee exodus that began massively in the spring of 1975 and continued steadily into the next decade, the liberal mythology was erased.

⁵⁴⁴Berman, *No Peace, No Honor*, 207–62; R. A. Burgler, *The Eyes of the Pineapple: Revolutionary Intellectuals and Terror in Democratic Kampuchea* (Fort Lauderdale, FL: Breitenbach, 1990); Karl D. Jackson, ed., *Cambodia, 1975–1978: Rendezvous with Death* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989); Marie Alexandrine Martin, *Cambodia: A Shattered Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 157–214; Edward P. Metzner, ed., *Reeducation in Postwar Vietnam: Personal Postscripts to Peace* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001); Bui Diem, *In the Jaws of History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).

Intellectually, America in the 1970s was rich and dynamic, benefiting from the liberation of academic thought from the processes of the 1960s. In all fields of science and in the humanities, knowledge was being produced at the same exponential rates that it had been produced for decades. In social science, a reinterpretation of social theory included race and gender as fundamental issues. Feminist theory and practice, largely unknown until the 1960s, blossomed in the 1970s, coterminous with all the political and economic crises of the time. In the physical sciences and engineering, the microprocessor was commercialized beginning in 1971, and suddenly semiconductor technology spread to every industrial sector and scientific field.⁵⁴⁵

Despite this, by the late 1970s it was clear to economists such as Lester Thurow that the industrial prosperity that had characterized postwar America was then a thing of the past. The postwar industrial boom had led Detroit to build a generation of very large and powerful automobiles for the American market. Eight-cylinder engines on four-thousand-pound cars were the norm until the early 1970s. For decades after the Second World War, American industry was secure in its dominance of what defined an industrialized society. The steel and automobile industries built the large cars that transported the large suburban families who subsisted on energy-intensive beefsteaks. The virtually unlimited use of oil, coal, and natural gas, “hydrocarbon fuels” to a later generation of Americans, was part of American culture. The energy crisis that began with the OPEC price increase of 1973–1974 suddenly turned America into a vulnerable nation.⁵⁴⁶ A national crisis challenged the prestige of a country that had already suffered enormous psychic damage from the political and social revolutions of the 1960s and was then caught in the grips of the growing political crisis over Watergate.⁵⁴⁷

After Nixon resigned in August 1974, the Ford administration inherited a deep recession, caused principally by the energy shocks of a year earlier. By the mid-1970s it was clear that America had lost something. It no longer could guarantee the endless prosperity of the first quarter century of the post-World War II era. Now the country had to come to terms with a new concept of American vulnerability and relative decline. From the mid-1970s until the end of the Cold War in 1990, this sense of national comeuppance and perhaps inferiority became a feature of elite American political culture. The new era of limits, based upon a finite capacity for growth, had brought America into

⁵⁴⁵Forester, *The Microelectronics Revolution*, 72–164; *Smith and Campbell*, *Information Technology Revolution*; *Hanson*, *The New Alchemists*, 132–222; *T. R. Reid*, *The Chip: How Two Americans Invented the Microchip and Launched a Revolution* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984).

⁵⁴⁶For the 1970s energy crisis, see *John M. Blair*, *The Control of Oil* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976); *Engler*, *The Brotherhood of Oil*; *Norman Metzger*, *Energy: The Continuing Crisis* (New York: Crowell, 1977); *Joseph S. Szyliowicz and Bard E. O'Neill*, eds., *The Energy Crisis and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Praeger, 1975).

⁵⁴⁷*John Ehrlichman*, *Witness to Power: The Nixon Years* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982); *Fred Emery*, *Watergate: The Corruption of American Politics and the Fall of Richard Nixon* (New York: Times Books, 1994); *Stanley I. Kutler*, ed., *Abuse of Power: The New Nixon Tapes* (New York: Free Press, 1997).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

a new age. It was clear that Japanese and German competition, particularly in the high-technology fields, were now direct challenges to American economic leadership. The economic crises of the late 1970s, including the oil shock of 1978–1979 that resulted in the highest energy prices in American history, precipitated the deep recession of the early 1980s. Coinciding with the international crises of the time, it was clear that no matter what Carter would do as president, his time in office would be brief. Only the election of the far-right Reagan was a surprise. The strategic challenge that the Soviets presented at the end of the 1970s, combined with the aggressive colonization of Marxism-Leninism in Africa and later Central America, was a precondition for the movement toward the right and the end of the revisionist Cold War.⁵⁴⁸

Reagan the Redeemer

In the wake of the Iranian hostage crisis and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the public had little stomach for the continued humiliation of the United States. Carter's failure to deal with the perceived expansion of the Soviet threat, the Iranian hostage crisis, and the rampant inflation that gripped the country in the fall of 1980 made Ronald Reagan the new president. Until the fall of 1980, Ronald Reagan looked like an unlikely occupant of the White House. Ideologically, he was not in line with recent presidents. His views were considered too far to the right on the political spectrum to allow him to ever win a national election. However, as discussed, Reagan came to the presidency at a time of national humiliation. It was Reagan's undisputed nationalist credentials that appealed to enough of the middle-income white population for him to carry 50 percent of the vote in November. The country had suffered economic, political, cultural, and strategic decline in the world. Reagan now would be the redeemer.⁵⁴⁹

Once more, the script had turned. In twenty years, from Kennedy's inaugural address to Ronald Reagan's, the orthodox script had given way to a revisionist one. In 1980, the revisionist script died, and its counterscript, the neo-orthodoxy of the conservative Republican movement in the United States, assumed ideological leadership of the national government. Reagan's script, which preached the liberation of the world from communism and the dismantling of liberal domestic institutions, would carry the country

⁵⁴⁸Thurrow, *The Zero-Sum Society*; William E. Simon, *A Time for Truth* (New York: Readers Digest Press, 1978); Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation*, 556–789; Richard C. Thornton, *The Carter Years: Toward a New Global Order* (New York: Paragon House, 1991), 231–527.

⁵⁴⁹Davis W. Houck and Amos Kiewe, eds., *Actor, Ideologue, Politician: The Public Speeches of Ronald Reagan* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993); Ronald Reagan, *Ronald Reagan: An American Life* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990), 223–40; Willard C. Mathias, *America's Strategic Blunders, Intelligence Analysis and National Security Policy, 1936–1991* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2001), 304–14; Robert P. Berman and John C. Baker, *Soviet Strategic Forces: Requirements and Responses* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1982), 61–73; Stephen M. Meyers, "Soviet National Security Decision Making: What Do We Know and What Do We Understand?" in Jiri Valenta and William C. Potter, eds., *Soviet Decision Making for National Security* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1984), 255–97.

forward into the 1990s and the post-Cold War period. In effect, his presidency was a rejection of the liberal technocratic order established earlier in the century by Wilson and later Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. However, he did not end liberal internationalism; he merely altered it around the edges. Too much influence remained with the internationalists in Washington, in both political parties, and in the business community, for a return to the pre-World War II right-wing nationalism that some of Reagan's followers wanted in the 1990s.

On the face of it, Reagan looked like an unlikely redeemer. The country that had experienced the rise and spread of a social revolution, that had developed a modern welfare state in the 1960s and 1970s, and that had undergone something of a revolution in the concept of civil rights, elected Ronald Reagan as a reactionary figure. Indeed, Reagan was the bulwark for that part of the electorate that had given up considerable privilege as well as tax dollars during the revisionist period. Now Reagan, unchallenged leader of the conservative movement, promised a return to an earlier vision of American culture. The liberal technocratic order, built upon corporate internationalism, international public institutions, private-sector liberal policy institutes or think tanks, foreign aid programs, and modern social science practiced in government and at leading university centers for graduate education, had to come to terms with a movement that rejected at least 90 percent of what the liberal establishment supported.⁵⁵⁰

In a fundamental sense, Reagan and his advisers viewed the United States as virtually all Americans did. Americans continued, despite the trials of perceived national decline, to believe in the virtues of being American. They remained loyal to the idea of American mission or redemption in a world that might appear hostile to its role. James Earl Carter maintained his dignity, and indeed in his postpresidency he acted in the full spirit of American/Christian redemption. Reagan assumed the role that foiled Carter because somehow Carter had lacked the "guts" to project American authority, and Reagan played his well-defined role with precision. There were problems in the revisionist script. The Soviets had lost their respect for American power, and the Third World too now raised itself in contempt. Europeans could act smug at America's seeming decline, and the Japanese were not very far from the moment when they would lecture the United States on its failures as a great industrial nation. Reagan was the man for all of this. He would reject the stigmas applied to America by foreign critics and national adversaries. He would move with the toughness that was expected of a conservative nationalist who served in the Second World War and still viewed the world through the script of that time. He would not appease America's enemies or those who challenged his conservative moment's agenda at home. He would define the last decade of the Cold War, and, as a

⁵⁵⁰Michael Weiler and W. Barnett Pearce, "Ceremonial Discourse: The Rhetorical Ecology of the Reagan Administration," in Weiler and Pearce, eds., *Reagan and Public Discourse in America* (Birmingham: University of Alabama Press, 1992), 11-42.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

redeemer of America's position in the world, he would end the Cold War that he had fought so vociferously for so long as a member of the opposition.⁵⁵¹

In the larger international system, 1980 was a period of widening problems everywhere. Despite the rhetoric over the increase in Soviet military power, CIA assessments clearly showed that the Soviet Union was in long-term decline, its industrial base unable to innovate from its Stalinist origins. The same was true of China, whose economic shortcomings were being evaluated by the United States as part of the emerging military alliance between the two countries. The fundamental characteristic of socialist economic systems around the world was obsolescence and bankruptcy. Obsolescence was the hallmark of socialism everywhere, not only in the Soviet bloc but in all the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe that had adopted socialist practices. The benefits of cradle-to-grave social welfare systems had to be weighed against the huge costs that the state imposed upon economic systems.⁵⁵²

In the United States, unknown even to the innovators of the industry, information technology was poised for the revolution that would transform everything. Yet, as Ronald Reagan assumed office in January 1981, waving the banners of conservative neoclassical liberalism and unreconstructed Cold War military realism, the world was unaware of the powerful structural forces—social, political, economic, and technological—that would shift national and global scripts. In Africa, the disasters of socialism and the still unidentified HIV epidemic were harbingers of continued disaster for decades. In Latin America as well as the rest of the Third World, crushing international debt threatened the survival of many countries' political economies. In the Soviet bloc, some predicted the end of communism, but its steely, authoritarian, machinelike institutions continued to reign without hint of weakening. The general worries for the planet—environmental, social, political, and economic—were large and growing. In the Middle East, Islamic

⁵⁵¹Steven Emerson, *Secret Warriors: Inside the Covert Military Operations of the Reagan Era* (New York: Putnam, 1988); Beth A. Fischer, *The Reagan Reversal: Foreign Policy and the End of the Cold War* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997); Mark P. Lagon, *The Reagan Doctrine: Sources of American Conduct in the Cold War's Last Chapter* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994); William I. Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy: U.S. Intervention, Globalization, and Hegemony* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Leon V. Sigal, *Hang Separately: Cooperative Security between the United States and Russia, 1985–1994* (New York: Century Foundation Press, 2000); Scott, *Deciding to Intervene*; Kenneth A. Oye, Robert J. Lieber, and Donald Rothchild, eds., *Eagle Resurgent? The Reagan Era in American Foreign Policy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1983); Haig, *Caveat*; Raymond L. Garthoff, *The Great Transition, American-Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1994), 252–372.

⁵⁵²Thomas G. Moore, *China in the World Market: Chinese Industry and International Sources of Reform in the Post-Mao Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Siwei Cheng, *Studies on Economic Reform and Development in China* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Azzedine Layachi, ed., *Economic Crisis and Political Change in North Africa* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998); Jo Ann Paulson, ed., *African Economies in Transition*, 2 vols. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999); Merilee S. Grindle, *Challenging the State: Crisis and Innovation in Latin America and Africa* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

fundamentalism, terrorism, and radical Arab nationalism threatened to ignite war with the West. Soviet client states in Africa and elsewhere were magnets for Cuban troops and East German secret police advisers. In Central America, Marxist guerrillas and right-wing death squads fought deadly proxy wars for the superpowers and in the internal struggles between landlords and peasants. In this era of so little prosperity and civility around the world, Reagan the redeemer became president.

Chapter VII

The Late Cold War: Communism's Collapse

The collapse of European communism in the fall of 1989 was shocking. The decline of the communist state and the delegitimizing of its ideology had long been observed in the West. Yet, in the carefully defined world of policy science and contemporary history, the notion of communism's sudden death contradicted the established view that totalitarian systems will not fall overnight. Many met the events with glee and thankfulness, but they were also met with disbelief by serious scholars and analysts who had no inkling of what was to happen. Historians who derided *histoire événementielle* as old-fashioned stuff now had to look at a case in which the structural characteristics apparent to social scientists did not appear to predict the startling events of the year. Political scientists, wedded to the balance-of-power theory, could not explain how suddenly the Soviets sacrificed the balance of power in Europe by giving up Eastern Europe. Other comparative or area studies scholars could not fathom the bloodless (Romania was the exception) revolutions that ended socialism in the Soviet bloc, and then in 1991 ended the vast empire of the Soviet Communist Party. Theories of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes that could hold power indefinitely based upon the extensive patronage networks and ingrained state ideologies of such states were now baseless. All of the intellectual work based upon the continuity and stability of socialist systems was now thrown away by seemingly spontaneous mass revolts. It now seemed, contrary to sophisticated theories of collective action, that fundamental needs related to human freedom held sway even when the most repressive regimes indoctrinated the masses.⁵⁵³

⁵⁵³Saxonberg, *The Fall*, 361–81; Wheaton and Kavan, *The Velvet Revolution*, 49–118; Rob McRae, *Resistance and Revolution: Vaclav Havel's Czechoslovakia* (Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University Press, 1997); Maier, *Dissolution*; Robert V. Daniels, *The End of the Communist Revolution* (New York: Routledge, 1993); David M. Kotz, *Revolution from Above: The Demise of the Soviet System* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 64–108; Misha Glenny, *The Rebirth of History*:

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

There should have been no surprise at all about what happened in East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Albania, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union. Communism's collapse seemed to have been ordained many decades before it happened. In copious writings that captivated a worldwide readership, Alexander Solzhenitsyn had long proclaimed to the West that the communist state was doomed. Year after year, thousands of refugees from the Eastern bloc escaped. Almost universally, they condemned their native lands for the horrific scale of repression that existed almost preternaturally. The depth of anger was intense, often obsessive. Former Soviets, Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Romanians, and Yugoslavians typically cursed the regimes that had imprisoned them. Still, intellectuals and analysts in the West, including those employed by the CIA, were unable to predict the collapse before it came. Certainly, public intelligence forecasts suggested that the Soviets were in profound trouble by the late 1970s.⁵⁵⁴ They remained a formidable military threat, but analysts who studied the political institutions and economic infrastructure of the Soviet Union as well as the Soviet-bloc states understood the nature of the crisis that simmered very close to the surface. Throughout the world, the Soviet economic model was obsolete. The Chinese had abandoned it, and, indeed, the Vietnamese would also abandon Soviet centralized planning. Throughout Africa, in North Korea, and in Cuba, the Soviet technocratic system was shown to be an enormous dinosaur. It would crush those regimes if they were not able to overcome the ideological and institutional patterns of Soviet domination. In the end, the Cold War's demise would turn out to be more of a joke in the West than a tragedy. In the former communist states, as so many informed observers would understand in the first years after the fall, the end was bittersweet, full of both tragedy and thanksgiving at the same time.⁵⁵⁵

The end of the Cold War came virtually overnight. After more than forty years of continuous tension and recurring crises, the conflict between the West and Marxism-Leninism in Europe ended with a whimper. Billions upon billions of dollars in debt, none of the Soviet-bloc governments could meet the demands of civil society. With the noninterference of Mikhail Gorbachev, who saw no virtue in the Soviet Union's continued subsidy of insolvent regimes, the Eastern bloc governments fell one after the other. The Soviet regime, gripped by the same institutional crises over economic solvency and internal political legitimacy, was in deep and irreversible decline. Over the following two years, with the Gulf War taking place within the same time frame, the Soviet Union as a nation-state began to unravel. It became increasingly impossible to sustain normal economic activity.⁵⁵⁶

Eastern Europe in the Age of Democracy (New York: Penguin Books, 1993); Padraic Kenney, *A Carnival of Revolution: Central Europe 1989* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002).

⁵⁵⁴George Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (New York: Knopf, 1998), 230–301; Garthoff, *The Great Transition*, 375–499.

⁵⁵⁵Maier, *Dissolution*, 59–107; Daniels, *The End of the Communist Revolution*, 167–90.

⁵⁵⁶Michael Ellman and Vladimire Kotorovich, eds., *The Destruction of the Soviet Economic System: An Insiders' History* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1998), 211–254.

The Soviets had long been viewed as one of the world's great industrial powers. Yet in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the Soviets showed the world how bankrupt their system was. The collective agricultural system was unable to harvest the food that it produced, leaving much of it rot on in the fields for want of harvesters. Oil, a key source of foreign exchange for the Soviet Union and a resource found in huge quantities in Soviet Central Asia, was being wasted by the Soviets' decrepit petroleum industry. Nuclear waste from the vast Soviet military-industrial complex poisoned large stretches of Siberia, and millions of Soviet citizens lacked energy in an energy-rich nation, food in a country that could produce a surplus, and clothing in a country that could manufacture thousands of tanks and nuclear missiles. In every respect, the disaster that showed itself in Eastern Europe was magnified in the Soviet Union, not only by massive corruption and inefficiency, but also by the immense ethnic divisions within the vast Soviet empire.⁵⁵⁷ What seemed impossible to most social scientists and Soviet scholars became a reality when, in the wake of the failed coup attempt of August 1991, the state fragmented and officially dissolved on January 1, 1992.

In retrospect, perhaps the end of communism was a surprise not because of its suddenness, but because it came so late, given communism's many disasters. The historiography of the last decade of the Cold War explores the reasons for the end of European communism. Clearly, the factors involved were many—if one understands historical causes as a result of factors. I prefer the same analytical categories I have used throughout this monograph. The Cold War ended when it did because the scripts decided it that way. The metascript for the conflict brought the superpower leaders together in the late 1980s as the Soviet system was dying. When Gorbachev met Reagan at Reykjavik in 1986, they spoke with each other knowing full well how just three years earlier, Soviet misperceptions of Western military maneuvers had nearly resulted in a nuclear catastrophe of unimaginable proportions.⁵⁵⁸ That crisis contributed to each man's understanding of the full context of the late Cold War. Reagan was a man who had spent much of his adult life, certainly all of it between the 1940s and his presidency, as a hard-liner committed to the destruction of communism. Yet, Reagan was also a man of intuitive intelligence who grasped the nature of the nuclear Armageddon that threatened his beloved nation. In what may have been his epiphany, he reached out to Gorbachev to end the ever-present threat to American survival. In turn, Gorbachev was influenced by Reagan's genuine desire to end the Cold War. The Soviet leader knew he needed the end of an arms race that the Soviets could not hope to win. Within three years of the Reykjavik summit, Gorbachev, responding to the profound economic crisis of his regime, began to negotiate the end of the military confrontation between Warsaw Pact and NATO

⁵⁵⁷Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001); Ben Fowkes, *The Disintegration of the Soviet Union: A Study in the Rise and Triumph of Nationalism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 121–79; Gail W. Lapidus, ed., *The "Nationality" Question in the Soviet Union* (New York: Garland, 1992).

⁵⁵⁸Garthoff, *The Great Transition*, 138–40.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

forces in Europe. In exchange for economic aid, he left his satellites to their own devices and, ultimately, to their own paths to freedom.⁵⁵⁹

At the beginning of the 1980s, with the exception of a few survivors from communist Europe who fervently wished its end, the imminent demise of communism was hardly apparent. On the contrary, the international communist movement saw the end of capitalism as the likely result that would ensue with the decline of American military power. In the early 1980s, the nuclear arms race between the superpowers remained deadly and threatening. Soviet rocket forces included the SS-20, a twenty-megaton warhead that could destroy a large metropolitan area. The United States had perfected the MIRV technology to the point of deploying 240 warheads on one submarine. This was enough nuclear force to render any country, including the Soviet Union, a radioactive shell. The expansion of Soviet forces in Africa and, most recently, the massive invasion of Afghanistan by the Red Army, contributed to the reciprocal defense buildup of the United States. In Central America, Nicaragua was a client of the Soviet bloc, as were the guerrilla movements in El Salvador and Guatemala.⁵⁶⁰ Cuba continued as a loyal Soviet ally. For its part, the Reagan administration continued a program of extensive anticommunist support in the Americas, Afghanistan, and indeed everywhere the Soviet presence was known. The Reagan administration, like its predecessors, had no qualms about a growing strategic alliance with China. American anticommunism was resolute

⁵⁵⁹Valery Boldin, *Ten Years That Shook the World: The Gorbachev Era as Witnessed by His Chief of Staff* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 146–248; Anatoly Chernyaev, *My Six Years with Gorbachev* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2000), 201–95; George W. Breslauer, *Gorbachev and Yeltsin as Leaders* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Michael R. Beschloss and Strobe Talbott, *At the Highest Levels: The Inside Story of the End of the Cold War* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1993), 153–214. According to Raymond Garthoff, an official chronicler of Cold War U.S.-Soviet relations, Gorbachev emphasized his determination to end the Cold War in a response to Reagan at the Iceland summit in 1986:

“The world has become too small and too fragile for wars and the politics of force,” Gorbachev said, in a prepared speech. The world had too many problems from the threat of nuclear annihilation to the vast needs for economic development and protection of the fragile global environment. (Garthoff, *The Great Transition*, 257)

⁵⁶⁰Roger E. Kanet, ed., *Soviet Foreign Policy in the 1980s* (Westport: Praeger, 1982); Erik P. Hoffmann, ed., *The Soviet Union in the 1980s* (New York: Academy of Political Science, 1984); Robert F. Byrnes, ed., *After Brezhnev: Sources of Soviet Conduct in the 1980s* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983); Steven Rosefelde, ed., *World Communism at the Crossroads: Military Ascendancy, Political Economy, and Human Welfare* (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980); Harriet Fast Scott, *The Armed Forces of the USSR* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1981); Brian MacDonald, ed., *The Grand Strategy of the Soviet Union* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1984); Edward N. Luttwak, *The Grand Strategy of the Soviet Union* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 72–118; Stephen S. Kaplan, “The Utility of Force,” in Stephen S. Kaplan, ed., *Diplomacy of Power: Soviet Armed Forces as a Political Instrument* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1981), 641–86.

post-Vietnam, yet the communist Chinese were irresistible allies who also wanted to liberalize their regime, ostensibly, through forging greater economic links to the West.⁵⁶¹

At the end of the Cold War's revisionist middle period, at the end of the Carter administration, the Soviets were immersed in their nuclear and ideological challenge to the West. They remained aware of their overall inferiority vis-à-vis the West in economic, political, and strategic resources. Therefore, to compensate for this, they concentrated on building a nuclear force capable of inflicting unfathomable levels of destruction. Socialism continued to advance on the margins in Africa and the Americas in much the way it succeeded in Europe and Asia. Organized cells of committed revolutionaries used all methods of insurgency warfare to achieve their objective. In Central America, the Marxists met profound resistance from American-sponsored regimes. The United States was not inclined to surrender El Salvador, Honduras, or Guatemala, and it was prepared to fund bloody counterinsurgency warfare to ensure that these countries did not fall to communism.⁵⁶² Powerful national security institutions in each camp worked around the clock to support proxy wars throughout the Third World and the nuclear and conventional war rivalries centered in Europe, the Atlantic, the Pacific, and northeast Asia. Containment doctrine did not change during the Reagan administration, from its earlier formulations among his Cold War predecessors. The technocratic orientation of 1980s U.S. Cold War militarism was transparent to the international public. Despite peace overtures in the middle of the decade, weapons systems development was a national priority for both the United States and the Soviet Union.⁵⁶³

⁵⁶¹Coral Bell, *The Reagan Paradox: American Foreign Policy in the 1980s* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1989), 79–120; Caspar Weinberger, "U.S. Defense Strategy," in William G. Hyland, ed., *The Reagan Foreign Policy* (New York: New American Library, 1987), 180–202, and Robert E. Osgood, "The Revitalization of Containment," in *ibid.*, 19–57; Stanford University, China-United States Comprehensive Security: Report of a Meeting (Stanford, CA: Northeast Asia-United States Forum on International Policy, Stanford University, 1982).

⁵⁶²A conservative defense of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America was made by American Enterprise Institute scholar Howard Wiarda. See Howard J. Wiarda, *American Foreign Policy toward Latin America in the 80s and 90s: Issues and Controversies from Reagan to Bush* (New York: New York University Press, 1992). The vast majority of literature on Reagan's Latin American foreign policy has been deeply critical to scathing. See William LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977–1992* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 72–340; Holly Sklar, *Washington's War on Nicaragua* (Boston: South End Press, 1988); John D. Martz, ed., *United States Policy in Latin America: A Decade of Crisis and Challenge* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995); Peter Kornbluh, *Nicaragua, the Price of Intervention: Reagan's Wars against the Sandinistas* (Washington, DC: Institute for Policy Studies, 1987); James R. Whelan, *Catastrophe in the Caribbean: The Failure of America's Human Rights Policy in Central America* (Ottawa, IL: Jameson Books, 1984); Robert S. Leiken, ed., *Central America: Anatomy of Conflict* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1984).

⁵⁶³John F. Reichart and Steven R. Sturm, eds., *American Defense Policy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982); Michael Mandelbaum, ed., *America's Defense* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1989); Daniel Wirls, *Buildup: The Politics of Defense in the Reagan Era* (Ithaca,

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

What was bringing the seemingly interminable conflict to conclusion was, first, the decline of Marxism-Leninism as a political ideology and *modus vivendi* for a modern state. There was little confidence among professional observers of the Soviet Union, including the Soviets themselves, that a centrally planned economy could compete successfully against the efficient market-based system found in the United States and elsewhere. The ultimate technocratic project of the 1980s was the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), or “Star Wars” project. Roundly critiqued as impossible and utterly destabilizing to the nuclear balance of power, the program captured the essence of the technocratic script—it was intended to control the enormous area of near-earth space. In doing that, SDI would extend the technocratic design for global order and efficiency to quite literally a higher level.⁵⁶⁴

Second was the ongoing crisis of the Third World. Debt-ridden, corrupt, and hopelessly impoverished nations struggled with every aspect of modernization and seemed to fail. Only the newly termed “Pacific Rim,” with its capitalist export-oriented economies, was successful in its development. The overall concept of development, linked to the Cold War rivalry of capitalism versus socialism, remained problematic. In the end, capitalism would triumph unabashedly, as all forms of socialism were in deep decline everywhere by decade’s end. Finally, communism itself would die as a worldwide movement. About this, nothing could be done. The script required its death. By the end of the next-to-last decade of the twentieth century, the Leninist paradigm for the state had run its course. The Soviets were to come to this self-realization only at the very end, when the decayed remnants of the Soviet edifice left the country short of food, fuel, capital, and any semblance of political authority.

NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), 1–55; Charles Tyroler II, ed., *Alerting America: The Papers of the Committee on the Present Danger* (Washington, DC: Pergamon-Brassey’s, 1984), 184–245.

⁵⁶⁴ Joseph S. Nye Jr., ed., *Seeking Stability in Space: Anti-satellite Weapons and the Evolving Space Regime* (Lanham, MD: Aspen Study Group, University Press of America, 1987); Ashton B. Carter, *Directed Energy Missile Defense in Space* (Washington, DC: U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, 1984); Stephen J. Cimbala, ed., *The Technology, Strategy, and Politics of SDI* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987); Rebecca S. Bjork, *The Strategic Defense Initiative: Symbolic Containment of the Nuclear Threat* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); Kenneth N. Luongo and W. Thomas Wander, eds., *The Search for Security in Space* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989); W. Zegveld and C. Enzing, *SDI and Industrial Technology Policy: Threat or Opportunity* (The Hague: Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen, 1988); Kerry L. Hunter, *The Reign of Fantasy: The Political Roots of Reagan’s Star Wars Policy* (New York: P. Lang, 1992); Sidney D. Drell, Philip J. Farley, and David Holloway, *The Reagan Strategic Defense Initiative: A Technical, Political, and Arms Control Assessment* (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1985); Steven W. Guerrier and Wayne C. Thompson, *Perspectives on Strategic Defense* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987); A. Fenner Milton, M. Scott Davis, and John A. Parmentola, *Making Space Defense Work: Must the Superpowers Cooperate?* (Washington, DC: Pergamon-Brassey’s, 1989).

Regional Dimensions

Like any well-constructed human drama, the metascript brought the Cold War to a decisive end. Thematically, generations of destructive authoritarian and totalitarian regimes coalesced around the phony scientific principles of the Leninist state, and, within just a few months, the world was missing a giant ideology that had dominated entire regions.

The last decade of the Cold War is best viewed in terms of regional history. The conflict was resolved or wound down separately in each of the world's major political zones. The Latin American, in particular the Central American, Cold War ended after the brutish guerrilla/counterinsurgency wars of the 1980s. After the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the leftist movements accommodated the rightists, who were under the auspices of the Reagan administration and the U.S. Congress. In the Middle East, the decade was marked by extreme tensions between rival states, as well as virulent anti-Americanism. The end of the Iranian hostage crisis did not end extreme hostility between the United States and that pariah state, nor did the release of American hostages provide any relief for the Iran-Iraq war or the large-scale Soviet intervention in Afghanistan's civil war. These major regional conflicts, as well as the Lebanese civil war, the explosive Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and sundry other wars and terrorist incidents, marked a profoundly disturbed environment for public policy of any kind. The United States, no matter its predilections for the promotion of liberal democratic political economy, was embroiled in intractable crises that transcended the Cold War itself.⁵⁶⁵

In East Asia, the situation was much better. The Cold War wound down in the sense that China and the United States were no longer enemies. The Soviets were considered a serious threat to the Chinese. The rest of the region was either aligned with the United States or remained allied with the Soviets, in part to deter China. Sub-Saharan Africa seemed far less of a worry in the 1980s than in the 1970s when Soviet and Cuban troops first arrived, mainly because socialism had clearly failed. Nonetheless, the Reagan administration poured money into the region to oppose the Soviets. Likewise, covert American aid also poured into Afghanistan and elsewhere. Even with the obvious failures of communism in the Third World, the United States remained aggressive in pursuing vigorous anticommunist activities against both Marxist states and guerrilla movements.⁵⁶⁶

Finally, in Europe, the 1980s began with severe tensions between the Soviet bloc and NATO. The Soviet development of an increasingly potent nuclear arsenal presented the United States with no alternative. It had to begin to match the enormous power of the

⁵⁶⁵Scott, *Deciding to Intervene*, 14–38.

⁵⁶⁶Thomas Carothers, *In the Name of Democracy: U.S. Policy toward Latin America in the Reagan Years* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); Alexander George, ed., *Western State Terrorism* (New York: Routledge, 1991); Eldon Kenworthy, *America/Americas: Myth in the Making of U.S. Policy toward Latin America* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1995); Scott, *Deciding to Intervene*, 213–53; Peter J. Schraeder, ed., *Intervention in the 1980s: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Third World* (Boulder, CO: Rienner, 1989).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Soviet deterrent. In the atmosphere of open competition for nuclear advantage, perceptions and misperceptions abounded. As a result of this climate of fear, nuclear war almost resulted in 1983, when NATO exercises in the North Atlantic were misperceived by the Soviets as the beginning of a preemptive strike. The near disaster led directly to the Star Wars project, which Reagan genuinely believed had the capability of ending the nuclear crisis.⁵⁶⁷ In the end, however, Star Wars had a more important function in preparing the stage for Reagan's brilliant meeting with Gorbachev in Iceland in 1986. Eventually, the scripted toughness of the military crisis, like earlier ones, led to the eventual relaxation of tensions and the basis for genuine negotiations. Not coincidentally, the introduction of Gorbachev's glasnost and perestroika policies were nearly coterminous with the implosion of Soviet communism in the late 1980s. The same man who met Reagan in Iceland, the leader of a superpower and premier of an absolutist state, presided over its dissolution some five years later. In the end, the reign of communism in Europe virtually disappeared by the early 1990s. Even if communist parties made a partial comeback over the ensuing decade, the old communist empire, once it had fallen, was never to be restored to even a fraction of its former glory.

Aspects of the Global Script: Political Economy

Each of the world's regions coped with the last decade of the Cold War according to the terms of its regional conflict system. Thematically, the underlying problem was not strategic, because that problem had been solved by nuclear weapons. Nor was it a question of "human freedom," when that idea was highly relative and culturally referenced. The crisis that brought the forty-five-year script of the international rivalry to an end was the path of political economy. The technological systems that maintained the socialist camp—indeed, the whole concept of socialism as a working political economy, whether practiced by communists or social democrats—had finally confronted absolute bankruptcy. Development did occur often enough under Third World forms of twentieth-century capitalism; however, development was more often disastrous, or catastrophic, under socialist regimes, whether in the Soviet bloc or in the wide expanse of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Marxist political economy, first instituted by Lenin, founder of the first socialist state, had reached its apogee in the mid-twentieth century, when heavy industry was the standard for national development. From then onward, the technological changes and revolutions of the last half of the century had less to with those industrial processes that lent themselves to centralized control than with those that did not. The market, a simple concept born in the seventeenth century, had proven itself over centuries to be the most effective information system ever devised. No more effective means of economic

⁵⁶⁷Fitzgerald, *Way out There in the Blue*, 208–09; Deborah Hart Strober, *Reagan: The Man and His Presidency* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998), 231–33, 249; Garthoff, *The Great Transition*, 138–40.

communication could be found. By attacking the market and in effect eliminating it, the Marxists doomed themselves to obsolescence and, ultimately, to self-destruction.⁵⁶⁸

Liberals revered freedom, and markets were deemed a central aspect of that concept, but the liberals defeated the Marxists not because of universal ideas of freedom, but because of the less glorious and pedestrian idea that capitalism was inherently more efficient than socialism. With the dawn of complex service economies and the information age, the gap in efficiency broadened exponentially. When the old Soviet-bloc states fell, after decades of subservience to the Marxist-Leninist paradigm, observers were astounded. The revelations regarding the decay and decrepitude of the former communist societies were stunning. The crisis of scientific socialism was systemic and global. In every communist state, the government struggled with basic production goals in agriculture, energy, food processing and distribution, and the consumer economy in general. Housing, automobiles, even pharmaceuticals and advanced medical care were areas in which communist systems had enormous difficulties. The economic crises and the populations' general awareness that they lacked something akin to political freedom created irresistible conditions for the widespread delegitimization of those regimes.⁵⁶⁹

In the context of these domestic crises, the confrontation with the West over human rights compounded the situation. Western ideas, carried by every communication medium, found their way into the communist states as well as into states governed by authoritarian regimes in all parts of the world. If the American containment system did not reach deep into the villages of the Soviet Union, China, the Middle East, and parts of Latin America, American culture did. In China in 1989, and indeed in Eastern Europe and everywhere in the communist world, the Marxist-Leninist regime was under siege by the ideas of Western freedom. In the end, the culture of the West was subversive enough to bring down the governments tied to the ideology of historical materialism. The music of Elvis Presley and Michael Jackson was as challenging to twentieth-century communism as the thoughts of Jefferson and Lincoln.

Epistemologies

The epistemological dimensions of the Cold War changed with the confluence of two events. These were the failure of socialist political economy and the emergence of the

⁵⁶⁸Saxonberg, *The Fall*, 167–205. For the 1980s international debt crisis in the Third World, see Bonnie K. Campbell, ed., *Political Dimensions of the International Debt Crisis* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1989); Peter Nunnenkamp, *The International Debt Crisis of the Third World: Causes and Consequences for the World Economy* (Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf Books, 1986), 35–110; Gordon W. Smith and John T. Cuddington, eds., *International Debt and the Developing Countries* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1985); William R. Cline, *International Debt Reexamined* (Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 1995), 203–344; Kunibert Raffer, *The Economic North-South Divide: Six Decades of Unequal Development* (Northampton, MA: Elgar, 2001), 158–74.

⁵⁶⁹Raymond Taras, ed., *The Road to Disillusion: From Critical Marxism to Post-communism in Eastern Europe* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1992).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

“information economy” in the West. The dynamic of the Cold War ideological rivalry was always centered over the comparison of economic systems. Socialism was always critiqued in the United States as either authoritarian or totalitarian and hopelessly inefficient in nature. The socialist retort was that capitalism was a form of imperialism on an international scale, while in domestic political economy it preserved the old class structure of nineteenth-century liberalism.

Certainly, the most important difference between the technocratic epistemologies of capitalism/liberalism and socialism/communism concerned political economy. To lesser extents, other areas of social, physical, and natural science and engineering were different in the West and the East. By the 1980s, socialist planning had proved itself to be not only grossly inefficient, but in effect terminally destructive of the industrial systems that subscribed to it. The recurring shortages of food and other consumer goods and the inability of socialist economies to produce complex technical systems such as commercial jet aircraft and advanced mainframe computers signaled the final defeat of centralized planning as a viable system of economics. The critique of imperialism always hedged on the alternative of a socialist world economy. The apparent failings of socialism to match the efficacy of market economies in any part of the world, combined with the mass appeal of liberalism’s freedom, effectively destroyed the vestiges of socialism’s internal legitimacy.⁵⁷⁰

By the time the revelers at the Berlin Wall began to chisel away at its surface, there was little left of socialism as a viable ideological movement. This was apparent to everyone around the world who watched the drama live via satellite transmission with a mixture of awe and disbelief. For American observers who had lived their entire lives during the Cold War, the spectacle was truly stunning. There was an air of surrealism in the image of the once-feared East German police state crumbling before the protests of common people demanding change. The script for the Cold War had suddenly ended. The epistemologies for the script, namely, the strategic planning involved in military operations and the ideological competition studied and countered by the State Department and the United States Information Agency (USIA), the Voice of America, and other civilian agencies, were all fading away now. Very quickly, with the blows of each hammer on the Berlin Wall, the faceless concrete structure that symbolized the Cold War was turning itself and its larger representation into history.

By the end of the Cold War, it was apparent that a new technological era was emerging. The industrial revolution, characterized by heavy industry, had run its course. While the sine qua non of twentieth-century industrialism, the demand for petroleum, had not abated (the Gulf War was fought in 1990), the information age was well on its way to omnipresence in the global political economy. The transition to service economies had begun decades before, and, in fact, by 1990 the advanced industrial states were

⁵⁷⁰Hans-Jurgen Wagener, ed., *Economic Thought in Communist and Post-communist Europe* (New York: Routledge, 1998); Daniel Denison, ed., *Managing Organizational Change in Transition Economies* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001); Anders Ashlund, *Building Capitalism: The Transformation of the Former Soviet Bloc* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

dominated by booming service sectors. Yet, the integrated circuits that had first appeared in the 1960s had come to define a new industrial or postindustrial age. Service industries were now oriented toward the production and distribution of information. In this global enterprise, the Japanese script for modernism was at a deep disadvantage. Japan stood at the top of the industrialized world in the late 1980s, but its artificial corporate barriers to foreign competition would finally make the country pay. No sooner had the Cold War ended than the Japanese began a decade of economic crisis.⁵⁷¹

Once again, the technocratic script moved the redeemer nation forward. The American economy boomed through the 1980s, taking advantage of its extraordinary capabilities in the new information-technology industries. The new industrial revolution favored the cultural and institutional script possessed by the United States. American scientists and engineers invented computers and software programs. These revolutionary technologies were the product of a society that seemed primed for the assimilation of these space-age technologies. They were technical and communication systems that reflected the particular cultural framework of openness and adaptability for which Americans had always been famous. Soon, the Russians, the Japanese, and the rest of Europe struggled with the technological superiority of the United States, which had widened considerably in the 1990s. At the end of the Cold War, it seemed as if the rest of the advanced industrialized world had ceded its pretensions to the United States. Unprepared by its operative foreign policy to be a champion of freedom everywhere, the country in the last years under Reagan and during the Bush administration found itself inheriting the remains of the old Soviet Empire. The United States also found itself as the acknowledged leader of the post-Cold War international system, by former British and French colonial societies in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. At no time in its history, beginning with the end of the Cold War, was the United States more influential, except in its role during and immediately after the Second World War.⁵⁷²

Information science had made the Soviet Union obsolete. It was impossible, given the rigidities of the command economy, to innovate the complex designs and product development in both military and nonmilitary fields that pushed the United States so far ahead of the Soviets. Socialism had proven itself a disaster. There was little that economists could say that was positive about a system that lavished money on a grossly

⁵⁷¹Jon Woronoff, *The Japanese Economic Crisis* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993); Christopher Wood, *The Bubble Economy: The Japanese Economic Collapse* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1992), 177–93; Ryoichi Mikitani and Adam S. Posen, eds., *Japan's Financial Crisis and Its Parallels to U.S. Experience* (Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 2000); Bai Gao, *Japan's Economic Dilemma: The Institutional Origins of Prosperity and Stagnation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 152–274.

⁵⁷²Lea Brilmayer, *American Hegemony: Political Morality in a One-Superpower World* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 11–57; James M. Scott and A. Lane Crothers, "Out of the Cold: The Post-Cold War Context of U.S. Foreign Policy," in James M. Scott, ed., *After the End: Making U.S. Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War World* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), 1–25, and Rick Travis, "The Promotion of Democracy at the End of the Twentieth Century: A New Polestar for American Foreign Policy?" in *ibid.*, 251–304.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

inefficient defense industry while ignoring the basic needs of a society that had suffered so grievously throughout the century. When the end came between 1989 and 1991, the Soviets presided not over decline, but over the collapse of the entire Soviet system. It was evident in the postmortem for Soviet communism that its destructive aspects were so profound that the system would have destroyed itself even if the rivalry with the liberal technocratic international system had not existed. In addition to food and consumer goods shortages, the deadly ecological consequences of Soviet industrialism were hopeless. By the end, the Soviet bloc was dying in the massive pollution that engulfed its major cities and turned its rivers and lakes into repositories of toxic and radioactive wastes.⁵⁷³

Marxism-Leninism as a political ideology and “scientific” epistemology was deeply flawed. How was it possible, under a totalitarian system, for effective innovation to take place, not only to meet the needs of the people, but to protect the people from the adverse consequences of military and civilian industrial production? There was nothing within the institutional structure of the socialist state to provide for the effective development of managerial competence, as understood under liberal capitalism. The Soviet ability to compete with the United States was highly selective. It was capable of building nuclear systems that rendered American advantage in the arms race a misnomer. Yet, there were insufficient technical resources, after fulfilling military requirements, to match American and other Western achievements in industrialization, including information technology.⁵⁷⁴

Chronology

The last decade of the Cold War was ushered in by a number of critical events. The election of Ronald Reagan assured the Soviets that a vigorous unilateralist response could be expected from the United States for any action they might take. Further, dissident movements arose in the Soviet bloc, and the tumult of war and revolution in Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America revived the proxy war status of the Cold War in the Third World. Around the world, political rhetoric and actions intensified the struggle between communist and anticommunist forces. In Eastern Europe, the early 1980s witnessed the the Polish working class challenge the authority of the Communist Party. After decades of forced rule, the Poles were ready, with the strong support of the United States and others in the West, to demand the liberalization of the Polish state. In the face of crushing economic decline and dependency upon Russia, the long-standing enemy of Polish nationalism, Poland was primed to give up its communist institutional system.⁵⁷⁵

⁵⁷³Murray Feshbach, *Ecocide in the USSR: Health and Nature under Siege* (New York: Basic Books, 1992), 73–130; Gary E. McCuen, ed., *Toxic Nightmare: Ecocide in the USSR and Eastern Europe* (Hudson, WI: G. E. McCuen, 1993); Boris Komarov, *The Destruction of Nature in the Soviet Union* (White Plains, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1980); F. W. Carter and David Turnock, eds., *Environmental Problems in Eastern Europe* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

⁵⁷⁴Ellman and Kontorovich, *The Destruction of the Soviet Economic System*, 297–311.

⁵⁷⁵Arista Maria Cirtautas, *The Polish Solidarity Movement: Revolution, Democracy and Natural Rights* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 165–205; George Sanford, ed., *Democratization in*

The Polish movement was driven inexorably by the crisis of socialism. Dissident movements throughout Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union were also motivated by what communism lacked vis-à-vis the West. The demands were both for material wants that were unmet, such as decent housing, food, and consumer goods, and for freedom as understood in the West. Some thirty-five years after the establishment of the Iron Curtain, the children of the generation that had adapted to communism demanded the end of it. The dissidents had antecedents in earlier protest movements in the 1950s and 1960s, and, certainly, millions of anticommunist expatriates in the West demanded a confrontation with communism to destroy it. Finally, in the 1980s, with the world poised at the beginning of a new industrial revolution, and with international communication via satellites the new standard, the Marxist-Leninist script had seemed to run its course, at least in Europe.⁵⁷⁶

In Central America, the Sandinista movement in Nicaragua and the communist groups in Guatemala and El Salvador remained strong and vibrant in the face of deadly attacks by right-wing armies supported by the United States. However, with the end of the Cold War, Nicaraguan socialism, under siege from years of destructive counterinsurgency warfare with the CIA-supported contras, ended with the election of a liberal government. The Americas were different from Eastern Europe. In the tropical areas of Central America, Mexico, and Brazil, and in the mountains of the Andean nations in South America, brutal inequalities generated by centuries of plantation capitalism maintained the region as a fertile ground for the Marxist imagination. The radical script for the Americas challenged the landed aristocrats and military officers who had held control over these nations since the nineteenth century. Castro had seized power in Cuba in 1959, and despite bitter internal opposition and the unalterable antipathy of the United States, he had successfully maintained his regime. With the end of the Cold War and the Soviet Union, Castro would be tested again, but he would survive.⁵⁷⁷

The Latin American script rewarded authoritarianism. It made possible the reign of Fidel Castro, the dominance of the Institutional Revolutionary Party in Mexico for seventy years, the thirty-eight-year reign of Alfredo Stroessner in Paraguay, and the decades of coups and military governments throughout the region. What made the 1980s

Poland 1988–90: *Polish Voices* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992); Arthur R. Rachwald, *In Search of Poland: The Superpowers' Response to Solidarity, 1980–1989* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1990); Jerzy Hausner and Tadeusz Klementewicz, eds., *The Protracted Death-Agony of Real Socialism: Political Mechanisms of Societal Life in Poland in the 1980's* (Warsaw: Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, 1992).

⁵⁷⁶Cirtautas, *The Polish Solidarity Movement*, 256–62; Michael Andrew Kukral, *Prague 1989: Theater of Revolution: A Study in Humanistic Political Geography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997); Attila Agh and Sandor Kurtan, eds., *Democratization and Europeanization in Hungary: The First Parliament, 1990–1994* (Budapest: Hungarian Centre for Democracy Studies, 1995).

⁵⁷⁷LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 505–90; Scott, *Deciding to Intervene*, 152–81; Sklar, *Washington's War on Nicaragua*, 123–250; Walter F. Hahn, ed., *Central America and the Reagan Doctrine* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

different was not the end of leftism but the rebirth of liberal traditions all over Latin America. The dictatorial regimes mainly disappeared, as democracy returned to Argentina, Chile, Brazil, and other countries in the region. Vitriolic anti-imperial, anti-American rhetoric disappeared as the Latin American states, many overwhelmed with public debt burdens in the billions, took the path of the neoliberal order. In the space of a short time in the late 1980s, Latin American nations began the process of privatizing national monopolies once held sacrosanct.⁵⁷⁸

The political movement toward the neoliberal economics embraced by the Reagan administration and, indeed, by all major university economics departments in the United States, demanded freer trade, the opening of domestic markets, and the welcoming of foreign capital to revive industry and create jobs. The Latin Americans, as well as the East Asians and even the weak communist parties of the faltering Eastern European bloc, assumed the efficacy of the market model. Socialism, practiced not only in Europe but in many countries in Africa as well the Americas and Asia, proved that it could not achieve what capitalist systems appeared to provide almost as a matter of course. In Cuba and in the African Marxist states that multiplied in the 1970s and early 1980s, producing enough food for the population seemed an insurmountable obstacle. In the Soviet Union, food production was inadequate, based as it was the Marxist-Leninist model for Soviet agriculture. It became quickly apparent how disastrous central planning was. Without the market, the ability of societies to effectively allocate resources was gone.⁵⁷⁹

In the Soviet Union, internal pressures grew, not only due to the failures of socialism abroad, but to the total failure of the model within Russia. As the Soviets and the Americans challenged each other in the wake of the Afghan war fought by the Soviets, and by the proxy wars in Central America, the communications and economic revolutions of the 1980s made state socialism a dinosaur. In this context, the Soviet confrontation with the Americans over the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) was one based on fear. Gorbachev knew, in the wake of the economic disaster that took hold of the Soviet Union in the mid- and late 1980s, that the communist state was to become a relic of the past. The world belonged to the United States and those in the West who identified with the core values of Americans.

⁵⁷⁸ John Peeler, *Building Democracy in Latin America* (Boulder, CO: Rienner, 1998), 141–64; Scott Mainwaring and Timothy R. Scully, eds., *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995); Elizabeth Jelin and Eric Hershberg, eds., *Constructing Democracy: Human Rights, Citizenship, and Society in Latin America* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996); Kurt von Mettenheim and James Malloy, *Deepening Democracy in Latin America* (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998); Leonardo Avritzer, *Democracy and the Public Space in Latin America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 77–134.

⁵⁷⁹ Andrés Solimano, Osvaldo Sunkel, and Mario I. Blejer, eds., *Rebuilding Capitalism: Alternative Roads after Socialism and Dirigisme* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994).

SDI: Strategic Defense Initiative

Since the seventeenth century, the Western metascript has promoted scientific knowledge and its applications. When Ronald Reagan, on the advice of certain conservative military scientists, proposed his idea of a “space shield” in 1983, it was considered by many to be both impossible to build and a potentially destabilizing force in the world. In a style of rhetoric particular to him and to other Americans imbued with the American ideology of redemption, Ronald Reagan said, “I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.”⁵⁸⁰

In a section of a speech totaling fewer than twelve hundred words, the American president enjoined the nation to resolve, through technological innovation, the nuclear crisis that confronted the world. Over the next few years, plans were made to spend upward of a trillion dollars over decades to develop an engineering structure of impossible specifications and magnitude. In a sense, it was the ultimate test for the technocratic state. How, given limited time and resources, could the world devise a defense system against the ICBMs of the Cold War? The missiles themselves were only twenty-five years old in 1983, and the nuclear age still less than forty. The Manhattan Project had in a sense compressed historical time, when in the space of four years it conceived and built the first nuclear weapon. In a few seconds in the New Mexican desert in July 1945, thousands of years of warfare between nations had become virtually antiquarian in their totality, worthy of museums. Conventional weapons systems would still be used, but the broader context of great power warfare was now at a radically different level. Indeed, the world of war and great power rivalries had changed so much in 1945 that the transition might have been counted in centuries or thousands of years, so that the year 1946 was really the year 5946 or 9946—or any time, for that matter. So, indeed, historical time had become compressed in the late twentieth century through technological innovation. Events unfolded in minutes and were transmitted around the world for television audiences on six continents. Information, which physicists had defined as the fundamental characteristic of matter, had become a nearly infinite resource for social scientists and policy makers.⁵⁸¹

Intuitively, Reagan understood this compression and extrapolated the experience of the Manhattan Project onto the next stage, a global missile shield from the weapons produced by the first project. The unique concept of SDI required, in its full application, the complete control of near-earth space. To accomplish this extraordinary task entailed extraordinary advances in software design and laser and satellite technologies. Understandably, to most physicists, and computer scientists in the 1980s, SDI's full and successful deployment seemed to be a flight into pure fantasy. The idea of tracking and

⁵⁸⁰Ronald Reagan, “Address to the Nation on National Security, March 23, 1983,” in *Public Papers of the Presidents, 1983* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1983), 1:443.

⁵⁸¹Fitzgerald, *Way out There in the Blue*, 147–209.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

intercepting thousands of missiles in their boost phase toward the upper stratosphere, or later in their reentry projections as they descended toward their targets in the United States, seemed to be a grotesque impossibility. Some two decades after its first proposal, SDI had not gotten much closer to reality, even with a very minor revision to the formulation of the project's mission (protection against rogue nations as opposed to a superpower's arsenal).

Reagan put his quixotic dream of a workable SDI to good use against the Soviets. It was perhaps the possibility of trying to match the American SDI effort that finally softened the Soviet position toward maintaining the Cold War at all. It is not certain whether Reagan was aware of the fallacies behind his strategic design. Clearly, it was paradoxical that such a deeply believing Christian, with fundamentalist views, as Ronald Reagan was could presume such enormous faith in modern science. However, Reagan lost no time in approving huge budget increases for an American military that had clearly lost its edge since the disaster of the Vietnam War. His aggressive nationalist rhetoric and his resolute willingness to use force when required were part of Reagan's leadership. Reagan's manliness and his military realism in foreign affairs were a critical component of his public persona and his leadership script. They combined with his interpersonal skills vis-à-vis Mikhail Gorbachev to allow him to bring the Cold War and its global metascript to a close.⁵⁸²

Indeed, Reagan inherited an international economic system riddled with severe problems. Energy prices had skyrocketed in the 1970s, reflecting the loss of control the West now had on that crucial resource. He battled inflation and severe recession in his first two years, hoping to turn around the climate of defeatism and self-contempt that had permeated much of American political discourse since the Vietnam War. The 1980s saw terminal crises in Latin America and Africa, as well as the Middle East and elsewhere in the world. Reagan's task was to promote the internationalist creed of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and indeed John F. Kennedy to hundreds and millions of the world's poor, who only recognized him as an image of America. Somehow, Reagan believed he had to create genuine free enterprise in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, even when his own cities, burdened with poverty and economic loss, demanded extensive public assistance.

It was apparent to most observers of the United States in the 1980s that the country was, painfully, coming to a genuine understanding of the severe problems of poverty that remained within the overall affluence of the United States. Overseas, the same complex mixture of internecine conflict and international relations characteristic of the post-colonial world, consumed nations. Reagan approved SDI, and Congress provided funding to the ethereal program for a machinelike defense system for the United States. At the same time, the contradictions of his foreign policy were recognizable in the actions of his proxy warriors in such places as Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala. Yet, the

⁵⁸²Garthoff, *The Great Transition*, 338–72; Fitzgerald, *Way out There in the Blue*, 412–59; Mary C. Fitzgerald, *Soviet Views on SDI* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Center for Russian and Eastern European Studies, 1987).

counterinsurgency wars, while politically important in the drama of the last decade of the Cold War, seemed less important than the more serious issues raised by the innovations produced in the advanced weapons laboratories of both superpowers. They were developing the weapons and surveillance systems that would never be used in war, unless it was a war that would risk the survival of everything and everyone. In SDI, Reagan combined his mystical belief in American technology with his practical ability as a politician to mobilize the political will he could find within the American public to support the project.⁵⁸³

Reagan left office in January 1989, just as the final crisis of European communism was about to unfold. His successor, George Bush, was left to manage the end of the Cold War and the initial transition period to the post-Cold War world. Bush was more of an internationalist than Reagan had been, but he maintained the same general principles for dealing with the Soviet Union and China. The apparent script for Bush was to manage the international system using his extensive skills in foreign policy. Limited to only one term, principally because foreign policy was really his only interest, Bush dealt cautiously with the final act of the drama. He made sure that Gorbachev, and then his successor, Yeltsin, retained control as the Soviet colossus fell to the ground.

Conclusion: Human Freedom and the Technocratic Script

The summary of what ended the Cold War remains perfunctory. The end of European communism, or “real existing socialism,” in Europe at the end of the 1980s signified the culmination of economic crisis and obsolescence and the revival of Western liberalism in the lands behind the Iron Curtain. Cultural diffusion and the disaster of scientific socialism conspired to abolish the legacy of Marxism-Leninism. Ten years after the fall, the ideology survived, albeit in highly circumscribed conditions in the Andean nations of South America, in Cuba, and in East Asia. Communist elites still rejected the liberal order, even though they found its products and methods of inestimable value. The same year that the Berlin Wall fell, the Chinese army attacked and killed several thousand demonstrators at Tiananmen Square in the capital, Beijing. Chinese communist actions in Tibet, against the whole of its population, had continuity with Mao Zedong’s revolutionary regime. These actions were also consistent with the behavior of other surviving communist regimes that maintained the West’s pejorative but accurate term for them: totalitarian.⁵⁸⁴

⁵⁸³Paul Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 142–43; Fitzgerald, *Way out There in the Blue*, 210–64; Robert A. Pastor, *Condemned to Repetition: The United States and Nicaragua* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 230–314.

⁵⁸⁴Craig Calhoun, *Neither Gods nor Emperors: Students and the Struggle for Democracy in China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 237–60; Nan Lin, *The Struggle for Tiananmen: Anatomy of the 1989 Mass Movement* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1992); James A. R. Miles, *The Legacy of Tiananmen: China in Disarray* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 13–74.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Clearly, the material abundance of developed societies such as the United States and Canada and the countries of Western Europe, the Pacific Rim, and elsewhere served as a brilliant attraction to the citizens of anachronistic communist regimes. Yet, the attraction to human freedom, taken for granted by the citizens of liberal societies, superseded material desires for most of the captives of the communist system. Many survivors of communism who escaped to the West during the Cold War had nothing but rage for their native lands dominated by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and the dehumanizing practices of state socialism. They would have acted out their rage, if they could have, at a system that denied them basic human agency and privacy.

Scientific socialism, the twentieth-century experiment in the technocratic organization of socialist societies, was abolished with the end of the Soviet Union. The project to establish centralized control and manage every aspect of a modern industrialized society along those lines militated against basic laws of human behavior. There was no feasible way a socialist system could ever compete against the dynamic decentralized agency that liberal market societies afforded their citizens. In the last analysis, the technocratic script blossomed under liberalism, and it died under state socialism. The complex institutional ordering of economic, political, and social conditions within nation-states had to adapt to the challenges posed by industrialism and, more cogently, the postindustrialism of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.⁵⁸⁵

The liberal technocratic order, under the leadership of the Reagan and Bush administrations, managed the end of the Cold War, the death of the Soviet bloc, and finally the end of the Soviet Union. Their mastery of the demise of socialism was less than complete. Neither they nor the successor Clinton administration had a coherent or effective script for the modernization of the now defunct and destitute lands of the former Warsaw Pact. It was clear how the Cold War began and how it ended. What was unclear or ambiguous were the machinations that carried the conflict along for more than four decades. The structural conditions for the Cold War ended with the weakening of the Soviet state and its allies in the 1980s, a consequence of their internal weaknesses and the external strength of a technological transformation that they could never hope to replicate or compete with.

The final paradox of the Cold War, which was unexamined by American leadership in the years following its end, had to do with the contradictions that defined the American response to communism. For more than seven decades, the redeemer nation, bulwark of international capitalism, supported anticommunist movements and regimes in every corner of the world. With the death of a principal global adversary of human freedom, the

⁵⁸⁵ Kennedy, *Preparing for the Twenty-first Century, 193–254*; Arne Holzhhausen, ed., *Can Japan Globalize? Studies on Japan's Changing Political Economy and the Process of Globalization in Honour of Sung-Jo Park* (New York: Physica, 2001); Harris and Seid, *Critical Perspectives on Globalization and Neoliberalism in the Developing Countries*; World Bank, *Globalization, Growth, and Poverty: Building an Inclusive World Economy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Jomo and Nagaraj, *Globalization versus Development*; Manfred B. Steger, *Globalism: The New Market Ideology* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002).

crusading nation had not fully come to terms with its own complicity in right-wing repression. During the entire Cold War, the United States supported anticommunist actions that amounted to the overt oppression of civil liberties and, in some cases, brutal repression and even war crimes. Since the early 1900s, in fact, predating communism, the United States funded, directed, and rationalized the actions of client states and governments. For American nationalists writing for conservative magazines and think tanks, there remained little to be said as apology on these issues. They remained issues only for left-of-center intellectuals, historians, social scientists, and journalists who investigated the darker history of the redeemer nation.⁵⁸⁶

Americans' lack of self-examination with regard to their institutional response to global revolution reflects in part the shallowness of American public discourse. It also suggests that over the long term, the hypocrisies of American actions should be of little or no consequence to the larger structural agency of the West's technocratic metascript. It was perhaps more important to the future of the United States and the political economy of the twenty-first century that the last decade of the Cold War saw the emergence of new information technologies. Fed by the production of information and technocratic epistemologies, the technocratic order remained strong and expansive. At the same time, the role of human rights, though essential to the meaning of liberalism, was almost incidental to what was technocratic.

In this view, the Cold War was not a battle for human freedom, but more one of dominance. The technological means that the United States brought to bear in Vietnam in the 1960s were overwhelming. In the abstract, America held the banner of liberalism and freedom in its assault on the North Vietnamese and Vietcong, who, indeed, did not share the liberal concept of freedom. Yet, the destruction of the Vietnamese countryside and the overall management of the war reflected the technocratic epistemologies of the American war machine. So too, at the Berlin Wall in 1989, the citizens of the German Democratic Republic demanded the basic freedoms that Westerners took for granted. However, in the end, the arrival of freedom in Eastern Europe had little to do with the overall structure of Western dominance in the post-Cold War world.⁵⁸⁷

⁵⁸⁶Sean Gervasi and Sybil Wong, "The Reagan Doctrine and the Destabilization of Southern Africa," in George, *Western State Terrorism*, 212–52; Cumings, *Parallax Visions*; Hogan, *The Ambiguous Legacy*; Chomsky, *Detering Democracy*.

⁵⁸⁷Adas, *Machines as the Measure of Men*; Mittelman, *The Globalization Syndrome*, 31–161.

Chapter VIII

The Post–Cold War World: Toward the End of the Script?

The Post–Cold War World

Advances in nano-science and nanotechnology promise to have major implications for health, wealth, and peace in the upcoming decades. Knowledge in this field is growing worldwide, leading to fundamental scientific advances. In turn, this will lead to dramatic changes in the ways that materials, devices, and systems are understood and created. The National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI) seeks to accelerate that progress and to facilitate its incorporation into beneficial technologies. Among the expected breakthroughs are orders-of-magnitude increases in computer efficiency, human organ restoration using engineered tissue, “designer” materials created from directed assembly of atoms and molecules, and the emergence of entirely new phenomena in chemistry and physics.⁵⁸⁸

The Cold War ended in a matter of months. Then a new definition, a new interpretation of the international had to be conceived. According to one informed observer, Francis Fukuyama, director of policy planning for the State Department, history itself had “ended.” Amid self-congratulatory rhetoric in Washington, the overall concept of what came next seemed utterly uncertain. One could have expected an expansion of tribalism and ethnic warfare and the clash of civilizations as predicted by Samuel

⁵⁸⁸Mihail C. Roco and William Sims Bainbridge, eds., *Societal Implications of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology*, NSET Workshop Report (Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, March 2001), iii.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Huntington, or a multipolar world fraught with dangers as Henry Kissinger asserted.⁵⁸⁹ Suddenly the world had no immediate script, no framework to allow the actors to behave in a concerted manner.⁵⁹⁰ The world's agenda remained that of more than a hundred nation-states each striving for its prescribed needs for economic development and security. Despite the impressive institutions and knowledge systems developed by the technocratic order, the apotheosis of humankind remained illusory. There were, however, undercurrents of order in the chaos. The world did not fall apart after the end of the bipolar system, but instead adjusted to the death of socialism, albeit with dissension and some bloodshed. In the end, the post-Cold War world in the early twenty-first century looked in many ways like the world before the Cold War, when power, not ideology, dictated the direction of international affairs. Still, the new age was ushered in by the awesome technological horizons of the future, which would include, no doubt, a new industrial revolution, or perhaps a revolution that transcended the very concept of "industry" or "capitalism" and would bring humankind into a new civilization that was transcendent of every aspect of modern history.⁵⁹¹

In conventional terms, the decade after the Cold War witnessed a return to the international system that existed, very briefly, following the end of the Second World War. Once again, a "preponderance power," to use Leffler's term, defined the new period in international history. In relative terms, American power was perhaps greater than at any time in history, with the exception of the end of the Second World War, when virtually nothing coherent remained of world power except the United States. In absolute terms, no nation or civilization had ever accumulated the power the United States had in the present age. Still, the redeemer nation seemed confused by its position. After the Soviet bloc disappeared into history, the political culture of the country was self-

⁵⁸⁹Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press, 1992); Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996); Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, 804–35.

⁵⁹⁰Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes*, 559.

⁵⁹¹Kurzweil, *The Age of Spiritual Machines*, 101–260; Calude and Paun, *Computing with Cells and Atoms*; Brown, *Minds, Machines, and the Multiverse*; Andrew Kusiak, *Computational Intelligence in Design and Manufacturing* (New York: Wiley & Sons, 2000); Gheorghe Tecuci and Yves Kodratoff, eds., *Machine Learning and Knowledge Acquisition: Integrated Approaches* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1995); Tarun Khanna, *Foundations of Neural Networks* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1990); Klaus Obermayer and Terrence J. Sejnowski, eds., *Self-organizing Map Formation: Foundations of Neural Computation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001); Frederic M. Ham and Ivica Kostanic, *Principles of Neurocomputing for Science and Engineering* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001); Robert R. Trippi and Efraim Turban, eds., *Neural Networks in Finance and Investing: Using Artificial Intelligence to Improve Real-World Performance* (Chicago: Irwin Professional Publishing, 1996); Thomas Lengauer, ed., *Bioinformatics: From Genomes to Drugs*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Wiley-VCH, 2002); Andrew Vinter and Mark Gardner, eds., *Molecular Modelling and Drug Design* (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 1994); Daniel C. Liebler, *Introduction to Proteomics: Tools for the New Biology* (Totowa, NJ: Humana Press, 2002); Morton Rosoff, ed., *Nano-surface Chemistry* (New York: Marcel Dekker, 2002).

congratulatory. It was now forcefully argued that four and a half decades of vigilance and defense mobilization had been victorious and morally right after all. The left's critique not only of American anticommunism, but of global capitalism, seemed to have lost its force. The market, celebrated by conservatives throughout the Cold War, achieved its own unique victory. Even when the state-centered climate of Keynesian and social democratic approaches to political economy were dominant in Europe and North America, the market economists at the University of Chicago and other bastions of conservative thought maintained their arguments. By the decade of the 1990s, throughout the world, the concept of the market as the organizing economic principle for development was accepted almost universally. The technocratic script, so enamored of the corporatist public/private development paradigm, was adapting to the market-oriented monetarist approach. Markets, in every aspect of human resource allocation, from heavy industry to the Internet, healthcare, and other human services, were accepted as the most effective institutional regime for transforming societies in productive and innovative ways. The utopian ideas of the last decade of the twentieth century were related to the powerful sweep of the market as the catalyst for engineering and scientific knowledge that would create the future world of endless abundance and personal freedom.⁵⁹²

With the final bankruptcy of the Marxist-Leninist state in Europe, the metascript for the international system closed the Cold War quickly. It was not the end of history; national rivalries remained intense. Yet, the Cold War as an analytical construct and as a living reality passed quickly into history. There had not been much of a good-bye to the generally stable bipolar international system. The scripts turned; they adapted with the end of containment and the nuclear rivalry. National scripts converged on the new dynamics of the new age, in which technocratic institutions and systems of knowledge—burgeoning scientific epistemologies—would fashion a new world. The new age would be based upon a larger cosmopolitan reality. It was a cosmopolitanism that was far more omnipresent in the new technologies of the Internet and the general telecommunications revolutions connected to the transformations of the digital age. By the early 1990s it was apparent that the new liberal technocratic order of information-based economies had

⁵⁹² Alan Peacock, *The Political Economy of Economic Freedom* (Northampton, MA: Elgar, 1997); Paul W. Drake and Mathew D. McCubbins, eds., *The Origins of Liberty: Political and Economic Liberalization in the Modern World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998); C. P. Rao, ed., *Globalization, Privatization and Free Market Economy* (Westport, CT: Quorum, 1998); Ian Vasquez, ed., *Global Fortune: The Stumble and Rise of World Capitalism* (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 2000); Robert J. Barro, *Getting It Right: Markets and Choices in a Free Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996); T. M. Wilkinson, *Freedom, Efficiency, and Equality* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000); Robert W. Poole and Virginia I. Postrel, eds., *Free Minds and Free Markets: Twenty-five Years of Reason* (San Francisco: Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, 1993); James Gwartney, *Economic Freedom of the World, 1975–1995* (Vancouver: Fraser Institute, 1996).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

nearly transcended the strategic politics of the international system. There was now in popular mood and in professional thought a pervasive sense of globalism.⁵⁹³

In this monograph I have proposed a theory of international history based upon one general thesis. In sum, modern history has followed patterns of integration related to institutions and systems of modern knowledge. This integration I have termed the liberal technocratic view of history and contemporary society. In turn, these integration forms can be seen as narratives or scripts and, in the largest category, metascripts. Human agency must always be guided or embodied in scripts. This has been true whether the script is related to the life history of individuals or, at the other extreme, the epochs of civilizations. For centuries, the metascript or metanarrative has driven Western culture and world history toward the expansion of global dominance of the liberal technocratic nation-state. In particular, the American century has witnessed the victory of the technocratic design of the American state.⁵⁹⁴

Throughout the international system, a huge, muscular, military-industrial institutional structure has grown geometrically in presence and influence. In the contemporary world, a vast assembly of human cultures, speaking thousands of different languages, viewing the world through thousands of separate cultural, linguistic, and historical perspectives, has been brought together. Rooted in many thousands of years of separate historical development, these cultures now interact through the virtual mechanisms of a proudly digital civilization. In that integration, provided by the information and communication revolutions of the present era, a huge ingathering of human diversity is taking place. Within the technocratic paradigm, the path of cosmopolitanism is clear. The international system has followed the liberal technocratic

⁵⁹³Kennedy, *Preparing for the Twenty-first Century*, 3–135; David S. Alberts and Daniel S. Papp, eds., *The Information Age Anthology* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1997), 141–253; Gerardo R. Ungson and John D. Trudel, *Engines of Prosperity: Templates for the Information Age* (London: Imperial College Press, 1998); Greg Hearn, *The Communication Superhighway: Social and Economic Change in the Digital Age* (St. Leonards, N.S.W., Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1998); D. Curtis Schleher, *Electronic Warfare in the Information Age* (Boston: Artech House, 1999); Gregory F. Treverton, *Reshaping National Intelligence for an Age of Information* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); M. I. Wilson, ed., *Information Tectonics: Space, Place and Technology in an Information Age* (New York: Wiley, 2000); Ken Ducatel, Juliet Webster, and Werner Herrmann, eds., *The Information Society in Europe: Work and Life in an Age of Globalization* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000); Ted Tschang and Tarcisio Della Senta, eds., *Access to Knowledge: New Information Technologies and the Emergence of the Virtual University* (New York: Pergamon, 2001); Wendy M. Grossman, *From Anarchy to Power: The Net Comes of Age* (New York: New York University Press, 2001); James C. Leontiades, *Managing the Global Enterprise: Competing in the Information Age* (New York: Prentice Hall, 2001); Anna Nagurney and June Dong, *Supernetworks: Decision-Making for the Information Age* (Northampton, MA: Elgar, 2002).

⁵⁹⁴Stephen Moore and Julian L. Simon, “Twenty-five Miraculous U.S. Trends of the Past 100 Years,” in Vasquez, *Global Fortune*, 55–89, and Rudiger Dornbusch, “A Century of Unrivaled Prosperity,” in *ibid.*, 91–111.

narrative because it survived the competing claims of its adversaries, fascism and communism. In America, self-described as a nation of “free and gallant people,” the scientific and engineering culture founded in the Enlightenment, not only survived but surpassed the authoritarian and totalitarian designs on the world system.

The technologies for the liberal society, founded on “free principles,” organized vast institutional and intellectual resources to create the systems of control that define the economic and political aspects of the world community in the twenty-first century. However, one would be naive to suggest that the triumph of the liberal technocratic script was coterminous with the extension of freedom or morality. Rather, the contested realities of the world wars and the Cold War point to the contradictions of liberal societies defending authoritarian regimes and neglecting classes and groups that were not connected with the political power of controlling elites. Nonetheless, the central legacy of the technocratic age has been precisely the expansion and power of the technocratic institutions and epistemologies for science, industry, and the state. Military and industrial power, evidenced in the vast innovations in the nature of war, industrial systems, and in particular the communication and information infrastructure of the developed world, suggest the power of the technocratic script.⁵⁹⁵

In the final analysis, the destructive conflicts of the twentieth century resolved a number of issues between nation-states and peoples. The atrocities that killed millions, including the Jewish Holocaust, the Japanese war crimes against Asians, the trench warfare of the First World War, the terrible firebombings of German and Japanese cities, mass starvation, the communist gulags, and finally the atomic bombings that destroyed two medium-sized cities in August 1945, deeply scarred modern civilization. They left world culture with a sense of its own mortality. However, like the physical systems in the universe that through destruction have also created the elements that have made biological life on earth possible, the great conflicts also led to development. The nation-state, conceived as an instrument of power in medieval times, used war as an instrument of force and destruction as well as development. The national rivalries and wars of the twentieth century also focused and developed the institutions and knowledge systems that have built the cities, industries, agriculture, and weapons systems associated with modernization in the twentieth century.⁵⁹⁶

⁵⁹⁵David S. Alberts, John J. Garstka, and Frederick P. Stein, *Network Centric Warfare: Developing and Leveraging Information Superiority* (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 2000); David S. Alberts and Thomas J. Czerwinski, eds., *Complexity, Global Politics, and National Security* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1997); David S. Alberts and Daniel S. Papp, eds., vol. 3 of *Information Age Anthology: The Information Age Military* (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 2001). These and related information-warfare publications can be found at www.dodccrp.org.

⁵⁹⁶Bernd Huppau, ed., *War, Violence, and the Modern Condition* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997); Paul R. Turner and David Pitt, eds., *The Anthropology of War and Peace: Perspectives on the Nuclear Age* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1989); Evan Luard, *War in International Society: A Study in International Sociology* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1986); Henry Barbera, *The Military Factor in Social Change*, 2 vols. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1998).

The Liberal Design: Markets

As we have seen throughout this narrative, the market is the simplest of concepts and yet perhaps the most powerful ever invented. Markets are simply a means of exchange between human beings. Yet, the simple act of exchange contains enormous information. No matter how deft the design of centralized systems, without markets as communication systems, efficiency will never be optimal. With markets, the basic tool of liberalism from the eighteenth century, the liberal design succeeded in its own terms. With the practical end of socialism, the market concept now permeates the world. The production of virtually everything in the digital universe is governed by exchange systems. Intellectual technology, which is the center of technocratic civilization, remains wedded, inextricably, to market mechanisms that govern much of its distribution. The political economy of the market defines the twenty-first century in every sense. The liberal rule of law, established in thousands or even hundreds of thousands of legal mechanisms, governs societies in both domestic and international spheres. Complex institutional systems control conflict and allocate resources in the context of markets. Professional knowledge systems continue to develop rapidly as a result of market structures that shape their production. In their totality, exchange systems extend their influence into every aspect of modern life.⁵⁹⁷

An age of “ordered liberty,” the promise of the New England Puritan culture, has survived totalitarian and authoritarian movements antithetical to democratic methods. In the age of enormous institutions and pervasive control systems, the authoritarian and totalitarian models, so admired early in the twentieth century, have been replaced by the only legitimate means of government. In this idea, liberal democracy, founded upon the basic rights of individuals, including the right of property, has become the standard for human freedom on a global basis. The liberal technocratic order, post–Cold War, has become the only legitimate international system. Nonetheless, there remains a distinct conflict between different concepts of that institutional arrangement. Despite the severe decline of the left, the fundamental concept of the ideological left remains current. In most parts of the world, the distribution of resources between social and economic classes continues to be an issue in the political discourse of industrialized nation-states. Further, other issues of equality and political responsiveness to human needs remain international issues of essential importance. Nonetheless, the liberal design for global development thrives.⁵⁹⁸

Unlike other contemporary writers, Ikenberry has emphasized the “persistence of order” in the post–Cold War system. See G. John Ikenberry, After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 215–73.

⁵⁹⁷See Stephen Gill, “Globalization, Market Civilization and Disciplinary Neoliberalism,” in Edward Keene, ed., *The Globalization of Liberalism* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 123–51, and John Gerald Ruggie, “At Home Abroad, Abroad at Home: International Liberalization and Domestic Stability in the New Economy,” in *ibid.*, 99–122.

⁵⁹⁸Jacques Baudot, ed., *Building a World Community: Globalisation and the Common Good* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2001); World Bank, *Globalization,*

The end of the Cold War represented more than the agreement between the two superpowers to resolve their military confrontation. It also represented the common destiny, the collective script, and the international culture linking the United States and the Soviet Union. The American script forged a moment of supreme power and greatness for the redeemer nation. Through its scientific, military, and business systems, the country had forged its informal liberal empire, its American technocratic order, in the last half of the twentieth century. In the end, the script carried by Wilson onto the international stage during the First World War remained essentially operational and was now inclusive of the former adversaries of Woodrow Wilson. The Wilsonian concept of the world, long disparaged by conservative foreign-policy thinkers, not only survived the Cold War; its principles defined the Cold War's ending.⁵⁹⁹ The principles of national self-determination, the rule of law, and the opening of the international system to an ever freer exchange of information, opinions, people, and products, all were part of the Wilsonian, that is, liberal, design for international order. The ideologies for American statecraft remained intact, engaged in continuing revision and positioning. Along with America's progressive tradition of Wilsonian internationalism came the technocratic and the nationalist promilitary views of international control and stability. The epistemological tools for institutional governance, including the foreign policy ideologies, established the nexus of cognitive modes that structure American and indeed modern consciousness about international relations.

Despite the sophistication of the institutions operating within the international community, the post–Cold War era began in chaos. The end of the Soviet system catalyzed the restructuring of regional systems. Eastern Europe, sub-Saharan Africa, and the Middle East reeled with brutal internecine conflicts no longer restrained by the stability of Cold War alliances. Around the world, Soviet power vanished and American supremacy became ever more apparent. Surprisingly, the United States had little interest in developing its already formidable power. Rather, the post–Cold War script appeared to call for a reduction in American overseas presence and a less intrusive program of American interest in regional conflicts. Hence, the Balkans were approached timidly by the United States, and so too were interventions in Africa and the Caribbean circumscribed by the limits of American national interest and political will. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the nature of American power—economic, political, and strategic—effused superiority and global leadership. Yet, although the redeemer nation did not steel

Growth, and Poverty, 53–120; Lance Taylor, ed., *External Liberalization, Economic Performance, and Social Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Philip Alston, *Globalization with a Human Face*, 2 vols. (New York: Human Development Report Office, United Nations Development Programme, 1999); Micklethwait and Wooldridge, *A Future Perfect*.

⁵⁹⁹Ninkovich, *The Wilsonian Century*, 268–79; Kenney, *A Carnival of Revolution*, 91–156; Andrew Nagasaki, *The Birth of Freedom: Shaping Lives and Societies in the New Eastern Europe* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993), 92–178; Glenny, *The Rebirth of History*.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

itself into neoisolationism, neither did it demonstrate a profound vision for global community.⁶⁰⁰

The Impact of September 11

At the end of the Cold War and at the end of the millennium, it appeared that the American script had reached a state of indecision or quiescence. Had the redeeming people decided once again that their mission now lay only in themselves? Had they decided that the pursuit of national order and prosperity was primary, and that globalism was secondary? Had the quest of Wilson and Roosevelt and Kennedy, as well as most other twentieth-century American presidents, become merely of secondary significance to the future of America? Certainly, the elements of internationalism were strong in the institutional scripts that continued to guide American foreign policy. Internationalism was also strong in the culture of academic and business elites, especially at major universities and large multinational corporations. Yet, the fire in the heart that drove American politics to fund the national security state, the Marshall Plan, and the Vietnam War had disappeared with the end of the Cold War. The world, however, had not disappeared, nor had it shrunk in appearance or importance.

The sudden destruction of September 11, 2001, changed the fundamental psychology of the post-Cold War period.⁶⁰¹ In a matter of minutes, the heart of the Manhattan financial district was engulfed in a disaster of almost incomprehensible scale. The impact was immediate and fundamental. The ensuing months saw the redeemer nation once again reorienting itself. The national security state, less than salient to public opinion prior to the events of that day in September, became of primary importance and consequence. In the short war with Afghanistan that followed, American firepower demonstrated the latest designs of computerized warfare and military intelligence. The Pentagon's weapons systems demolished targets from the air with precision and almost omniscient power over the country's formidable topography. War, in the twenty-first century, seemed to have become more an exercise in the application of advanced information technology with deadly explosive munitions. American power was magnified

⁶⁰⁰Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Out of Control: Global Turmoil on the Eve of the Twenty-first Century* (New York: Scribner, 1993), 147–201; Jim A. Keepers, *Presidential Crisis Rhetoric and the Press in the Post-Cold War World* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997); Cohen, *Failed Crusade*, 71–154; Peter J. Schraeder, *United States Foreign Policy toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis, and Change* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 198–226; Steven Hurst, *The Foreign Policy of the Bush Administration: In Search of a New World Order* (New York: Pinter, 1999); Warren Zimmermann, *Origins of a Catastrophe: Yugoslavia and Its Destroyers—America's Last Ambassador Tells What Happened and Why* (New York: Random House, 1996); Donald M. Snow, *Puzzle Palaces and Foggy Bottom: U.S. Foreign and Defense Policy-Making in the 1990s* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994); David Halberstam, *War in a Time of Peace* (New York: Scribner, 2001), 224–31, 352–59.

⁶⁰¹Strobe Talbott and Nayan Chanda, eds., *The Age of Terror: America and the World after September 11* (New York: Basic Books, 2001); Fred Halliday, *Two Hours That Shook the World: September 11, 2001: Causes and Consequences* (London: Saqi, 2002).

by the effective use of coalition warfare. The short Afghan war allowed the United States to quickly mobilize NATO and erstwhile rivals Russia and China into a broad antiterrorism coalition that included most of the Arab world as well. As always, massive military power had to be managed with effective public diplomacy. The war was fought using political, economic, strategic, and psychological means. The managerial state, under the direction of George W. Bush's inveterate national security team, projected the effective use of American power in the Third World.⁶⁰²

Beyond the national security state, however, September 11 forced American society to return to the pressing matters confronting most of the world. The new war against terrorism, as it was called, had signaled to American leadership groups the underlying sources of political stability and, indeed, danger. Previously, the diminution of American interest in foreign policy and the reshaping of the national script vis-à-vis the rest of the world had not belied the fact that at the start of the new century, huge development challenges presented themselves. If high-definition television was a priority in the first world, in the Third World unsafe drinking water, unexploded land mines, and HIV infection, among other diseases, were of more immediate and life-threatening concern. An idea that simmered among the cosmopolitan elites, but was largely unknown to the privileged middle class of the developed world, was the desperate fate of the poor. The wealthy American and European publics seemed mesmerized by the new digital age; yet, their leaders had to come to terms with the most elementary and desperate problems of billions of people. As the world's population grew past five and then six billion, vast inequalities associated more with the French or Russian Revolutions were apparent between the First and the Third Worlds. As a result of failed modernization in scores of nation-states, the political economy of the globe left more than a billion human beings in abject poverty, unable to have the most basic of human needs fulfilled. Further, billions more clearly deprived vis-à-vis the upper quartile of the developed states languished on every continent.⁶⁰³

Never in world history had so much technological potential presented itself. The forces of the liberal technocratic script promised profound, even exponential, change. The technique of advanced information technology projected radical transformations in the new century. There would be quantum-level devices to manipulate the world into a state of superabundance, far beyond what was possible in the twentieth century.

⁶⁰²Ivo Daalder and James M. Lindsay, "Nasty, Brutish and Long: America's War on Terrorism," *Current History* (December 2001): 403–9; Michael O'Hanlon, "A Flawed Masterpiece," *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 3 (March/April 2002): 47–63.

⁶⁰³Thomas Angotti, *Metropolis 2000: Planning, Poverty, and Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 72–109; Eileen Stillwaggon, *Stunted Lives, Stagnant Economies: Poverty, Disease, and Underdevelopment* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 207–302; Tom Brass, *Peasants, Populism, and Postmodernism: The Return of the Agrarian Myth* (Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000); Bob Baulch and John Hoddinott, eds., *Economic Mobility and Poverty Dynamics in Developing Countries* (Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2000); *Fields, Distribution and Development*; Nagy Hanna and Robert Picciotto, eds., *Making Development Work: Development Learning in a World of Poverty and Wealth* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

Nanotechnology, biotechnology, and related epistemologies of advanced engineering disciplines suggested an age of fantastic innovation. The digital age quantified and distributed technocratic epistemologies like no previous epoch. Now knowledge was not only universal; it was nearly infinite. An electronic information-based society established institutions and created fields of knowledge, that is, epistemologies, that promised the end of the technocratic script. The end of the script would find the whole world digitalized, from manufacturing to medicine to the very nature of human consciousness. The machine, at one time composed of nothing more than molded iron or steel components, was now electronic and ephemeral, but vastly more powerful. Institutions disseminated the new engines of the world—software and hardware, concepts such as e-commerce and Internet portals. Then came the time to examine the massive forces driving world civilization toward a new concept of human experience.⁶⁰⁴

Contradictions in the Liberal Script

The victory—or, some would say, the triumph—of the liberal script has not falsified Marx's concept of capitalism's contradictions. Into the twenty-first century, capitalism remained a source of enormous innovation and wealth, but also a profound source of inequality. True to Marx's teleological view of history, capitalism built a vast technocratic civilization in which machine information systems dominated. The means of production, according to the Hegelian dialectic, had created the conditions for capitalism's abolition. So the machine, which had revolutionized the economic life of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, promises to transcend the civilization that created it in the twenty-first. Yet, the munificence of beautiful suburban landscapes in the advanced industrial states coexists, in the same global system, with the destitution of more than a billion people. As cosmopolitan centers focused on the new machine intelligence, human populations on the periphery struggled with physical survival. In the year 2000, engineers designed complex information systems that modeled the world's climate and natural resources from data captured from satellites in near-earth orbit. At the same time, thousands of miles away, women living in the world's largest desert earned their living collecting bags of sand from windswept houses. The same class pyramid that was present in eighteenth-century France and England exists on a global scale in the early twenty-first century. Exquisite public space at the center of great world cities remains juxtaposed with the extreme poverty in American inner cities and, indeed, in urban and rural communities on every continent.⁶⁰⁵

⁶⁰⁴Toru Ishida and Katherine Isbister, eds., *Digital Cities: Technologies, Experiences, and Future Perspectives* (New York: Springer, 2000); Michael Gurstein, ed., *Community Informatics: Enabling Communities with Information and Communications Technologies* (Hershey, PA: Idea Group, 2000).

⁶⁰⁵John Dixon and David Macarov, eds., *Poverty: A Persistent Global Reality* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 229–47; Judith Goode and Jeff Maskovsky, eds., *New Poverty Studies: The Ethnography of Power, Politics, and Impoverished People in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 2001); Ernesto M. Pernia, ed., *Urban Poverty in Asia: A Survey of Critical*

Even as capitalism evolves as an intellectual technology and as an institutional system, its contradictions remain. The dynamism of metropolitan cultures and the rich commercial, scientific, and technological enterprises of the West, nestled in air-conditioned offices and laboratories in suburban corporate parks and luxury high-rise towers, must share the same world with the poor. The vast shantytowns and slums of the global poor exist sometimes within blocks of the technocratic cosmopolitanism of elite culture. Coexisting in real time with the dense skyscrapers of Manhattan and the suburban offices in Palo Alto, California; Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Schaumburg, Illinois, as well as in London, Paris, Tokyo, Moscow, and elsewhere, are the hundreds of millions of subsistence farmers, migrant workers, and destitute masses of unemployed in the Third World and the former Soviet bloc. In the mid-1990s, a telecommunications revolution gripped the West with the promise of fiber optic and wireless communications. In China, the enormity of the labor surplus made the employment of, quite literally, a “human billboard” an economical alternative to renting land for a real one. The contradictions remain almost too stark to comprehend.⁶⁰⁶

As the technocratic century ended, advanced research laboratories in the United States, Europe, and Japan raced to perfect the new-age technologies. Nanotechnology, quantum-level computing, wireless and fiber optic telecommunications, and the new and daring fields of biotechnology promised a new civilization. As government, corporate, and university laboratories moved ahead with the expansive possibilities of their work, huge social problems beset the Third World. All over Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and the former communist states of Europe, the quest for Western modernization left desperate poverty, disease, ecological and industrial decline, and vested despotic regimes. The liberal design had failed to prevent genocide in Africa, brutal violence in Southeast Asia, and the debasement and destruction of indigenous peoples and their habitats around the world. The Marxist-Leninist critique held, even if the ideology was now a ghost. The rich became richer, and the poor, in so many regions, multiplied in number and destitution.⁶⁰⁷

Issues (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Ramón López and Alberto Valdés, eds., *Rural Poverty in Latin America* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 2000).

⁶⁰⁶Wang Xiaoli and Bai Nanfeng, *The Poverty of Plenty* (Houndmills, MD: Macmillan, 1991); David C. Schak, *A Chinese Beggars' Den: Poverty and Mobility in an Underclass Community* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988); Dorothy J. Solinger, *Contesting Citizenship in Urban China: Peasant Migrants, the State, and the Logic of the Market* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 194–275; John Knight and Lina Song, *The Rural-Urban Divide: Economic Disparities and Interactions in China* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 319–43.

⁶⁰⁷Douglas Vickers, *The Tyranny of the Market: A Critique of Theoretical Foundations* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), 215–38; Michel Chossudovsky, *The Globalisation of Poverty: Impacts of IMF and World Bank Reforms* (London: Zed Books, 1997); Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Globalization and Its Discontents* (New York: Norton, 2002); Dixon and Macarov, *Poverty*; Richard Falk, *Predatory Globalization: A Critique* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999); John McMurtry, *Unequal Freedoms: The Global Market as an Ethical System* (Toronto: Garamond

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

The technocratic script for socialism failed almost everywhere. Communist and state socialist regimes declined or were overthrown. The liberal paradigm, by the end of the 1980s, was the only one a rational nation-state could hope to follow. Within that paradigm there was still a rivalry of sorts between American and European versions. There was still the important distinction between American liberalism, which emphasized the growth of capitalism and the vitality of individual business owners, and the European social liberalism that guaranteed a far more comprehensive system of healthcare, housing, pensions, and the like. The American neoclassical model, promoted by conservative administrations from 1980 onward, proved its utility just as the “democratic socialist” model of Northern, Central, and Western Europe had to come to terms with its frightful costs. Globally, the efficiency model of capitalism continued to gain ground against the compassionate social democratic model of liberals and social democrats.⁶⁰⁸

Keynesian and monetarist traditions, fully institutionalized at American universities, dominated the economic thinking of the new age. Entire countries, such as Russia, Chile, Brazil, and others, were run by American-trained economists who attempted to model their countries’ development according to the body of academic economic research produced in the United States.⁶⁰⁹ Although with the end of the Cold War the military presence of the United States had receded, the relative and absolute strength of the armed forces had not. The end of the confrontation with the Soviet Union did not end the mission of the national security state. Instead, the centralized problem of containment was replaced by the amorphous demands of an exploding world population rife with internecine conflicts.

Press, 1998), 159–320; William K. Tabb, *Unequal Partners: A Primer on Globalization* (New York: Norton, 2002), 1–83, and *The Amoral Elephant: Globalization and the Struggle for Social Justice in the Twenty-first Century* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001).

⁶⁰⁸Mauricio Rojas, *The Rise and Fall of the Swedish Model* (London: Social Market Foundation, Centre for Post-Collectivist Studies, 1998); Richard B. Freeman, Robert Topel, and Birgitta Swedenborg, eds., *The Welfare State in Transition: Reforming the Swedish Model* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); Colin Crouch and Wolfgang Streeck, eds., *Political Economy of Modern Capitalism: Mapping Convergence and Diversity* (London: Sage, 1997); Rebecca Harding and William E. Paterson, eds., *The Future of the German Economy: An End to the Miracle?* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000); Beatrice Weder, *Model, Myth, or Miracle: Reassessing the Role of Governments in the East Asian Experience* (New York: United Nations University Press, 1999); Joseph E. Stiglitz and Shahid Yusuf, eds., *Rethinking the East Asia Miracle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁶⁰⁹Juan Gabriel Valdes, *Pinochet’s Economists: The Chicago School in Chile* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Olivier Jean Blanchard, Kenneth A. Froot, and Jeffrey D. Sachs, eds., *The Transition in Eastern Europe*, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Jeffrey Sachs, *Poland’s Jump to the Market Economy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993); Carlos E. Paredes and Jeffrey D. Sachs, eds., *Peru’s Path to Recovery: A Plan for Economic Stabilization and Growth* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1991); Wing Thye Woo, Jeffrey D. Sachs, and Klaus Schwab, eds., *The Asian Financial Crisis: Lessons for a Resilient Asia* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000).

It was then far more difficult to control rogue states no longer under the influence of the Soviet Union. Terrorism in all its real and potential forms challenged the ability of the United States to build effective international deterrence. The possibilities were legion. It was entirely possible for terrorists or their agents to effect horrific damage. The Oklahoma City bombing of the mid-1990s suggested that little needed to be known about sophisticated munitions or spying for major destruction to occur. As the technocratic age presented the world with democracy and unprecedented affluence, it also gave it totalitarianism, genocide, and weapons of mass destruction. The liberal script had built strong civil and government institutions to support the technocratic organization of the world's political economy and democratic processes. However, the failure to address the structural crises of local and regional political economies that ensued in spite of, or as a result of, globalization threatened the emerging super age of digital systems with not only terrorism but the specter of continued and very deadly international warfare.⁶¹⁰

The national security state did not cease to exist with the end of the Cold War. The post-Cold War global environment had to be understood and assessed in terms of the threats that it presented to the United States. Major institutions, the Pentagon, the intelligence agencies, and the State Department, as well as the White House and the leading nongovernmental centers for national security studies, began the process of reassessment. This soon led to the restructuring of the mechanisms for deterrence in the new age. Over the course of the first decade of the new period, security had not disappeared as a priority, but was merely redefined. There remained much to concern the national security expert. There were now new threat projections for a new world of bioterrorism, nuclear proliferation, and the emerging military threats in East Asia and the Middle East. Collecting, interpreting, and effecting the management of the strategic environment remained a central task for the United States government. The preeminent liberal technocratic state continued to follow its script. The state maintained its active participation in the strategic, political, and economic environments of the United States in the international system. The Bush and Clinton administrations maintained the internationalist objectives of expanding corporate internationalism and, in general, increasing the domain of international law. There was a global agenda that the United States, albeit subject to domestic politics, participated in with great interest. International conferences supported the desire of the international community to aid public health, global and regional ecology, human rights, and economic development. The Wilsonian

⁶¹⁰ Jack Hirshleifer, *The Dark Side of the Force: Economic Foundations of Conflict Theory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Edward M. Spiers, *Weapons of Mass Destruction: Prospects for Proliferation* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 57–75, 140–56; Henry Sokolski and James M. Ludes, eds., with a foreword by John J. Fialka, *Twenty-first Century Weapons Proliferation: Are We Ready?* (Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2001); Paul Bracken, *Fire in the East: The Rise of Asian Military Power and the Second Nuclear Age* (New York: HarperCollins, 1999), 114–70; Richard A. Falkenrath, Robert D. Newman, and Bradley A. Thayer, *America's Achilles' Heel: Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Terrorism and Covert Attack* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998).

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

mode of understanding was not dead. Rather, Wilsonianism remained the formal ideology of the liberal design. In an age of countervailing public and private institutional interests acting in a multinational environment, genuine control of global processes seemed well-nigh impossible. In the global planning offices of the advanced states, the technocratic modes of understanding constructed a world that mixed Wilsonian principles with the pragmatic concerns of political and technical constraints. The result was less than stellar.⁶¹¹

Kissingerian realism was not welcome in the American script during the first decade of the post-Cold War period. Rather, neo-Wilsonian ideology, surviving the conservative diatribes for decades, rose in the new era and embraced human rights as a broad mission for the country. However, despite high rhetoric on defending humanity, the final implementation of such concerns for children, women, and universal adult suffrage were mixed. Humanitarian ideals were compromised by the bureaucratic mechanisms for enforcement and the political weaknesses inherent in international organizations. The same was true for the field of international arms control. The Wilsonian rhetoric and intentions were tempered by political and strategic realities. So, the Chinese military was armed by Israel and Russia, and Iran was in due course armed by China and North Korea. Violent rogue groups such as the Taliban, an extremist Islamic group, ruled Afghanistan as the century and millennium turned. Sudan, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, and North Korea remained nation-states outside of the conventional principles of the liberal order. The liberal design, whether in its Wilsonian or technocratic modalities, could not control the seemingly dangerous factions that challenged its international rule on the margins.

Despite the new mechanisms for control—the sophisticated instruments, data processing and analysis, and well-established legal and organizational structures for the creation of public order—the modern international system struggled with division, chaos, and incoherence. Clearly, some parts, some places, and some departments of modernity have in fact ordered themselves to a high degree. The clean, almost antiseptic office buildings of major corporations, the perfect digitalized accounting records and legal documents that define the modern corporation, and the thoroughly scientific professional cultures that define major research institutions—these indeed are the high art of the technocratic in the early twenty-first century.⁶¹² Chaos may be more common among the “teeming masses,” whether in the First or Third Worlds. Disorder has been found in the

⁶¹¹Jeffrey D. Sachs and Wing Thye Woo, “Understanding the Asian Financial Crisis,” in Woo, Sachs, and Schwab, eds., *The Asian Financial Crisis*, 14–43; Baudot, *Building a World Community*, 55–81; Falk, *Predatory Globalization*, 9–63; Brink Lindsey, “*The Invisible Hand vs. the Dead Hand*,” in Vasquez, *Global Fortune*, 43–53; Chossudovsky, *The Globalization of Poverty*, 76–122.

⁶¹²Garry Stevens, *The Reasoning Architect: Mathematics and Science in Design* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990); Chun Wei Choo, *Information Management for the Intelligent Organization: The Art of Scanning the Environment* (Medford, NJ: American Society for Information Science, 1998), 1–22, 71–104; Thomas Schal, *Workflow Management Systems for Process Organizations* (New York: Springer, 1996).

violence and warfare of the peripheral regions of the world system. At the dawn of the third millennium, brutal revenge and tribal war were still to be found in Afghanistan, Algeria, Iraq, sub-Saharan Africa, the Andes, the Balkans, the Caucasus, in American inner cities, and in other famous backwaters. The same apposite themes resonated in the new age. Could the liberal technocratic regime that dominated the political economy of the West, that defined the essential nature of the Western metascript, finally triumph over the chaos, the cruel disparities of the age? Could the scientific and technological revolutions that permeated the commerce, political and intellectual discourse, and strategic planning of nation-states be able to, finally, end poverty, inequality, and the general phenomenon of material scarcity in what most observers view to be a finite world? These were questions for serious deliberation. The risks for the United States, it was surmised, would multiply the longer the problems of inequality and horrible poverty plagued a world of superabundance.⁶¹³

There seemed little chance that the older collectivist model for redistributing national wealth would be implemented again anywhere in the world. The lucky few who lived in such centers of postmodern elitism as Manhattan, Beverly Hills, and the most affluent and educated neighborhoods in every part of the developed world would never be required to surrender their holdings or their lifestyles. The managerial, intellectual, and social elites in North America, Europe, East Asia, and indeed everywhere else would never have to sacrifice material privilege for the greater good of humanity. With the active opposition to leveling or wealth redistribution nearly universal, it seemed unlikely that egalitarian notions of material wealth would likely reach much higher than the rhetoric of social democrats in selected multiparty systems. Economic populism in the United States had reached its high tide before the turn of the twentieth century with the candidacy of William Jennings Bryan. Since then, sharing the wealth had fallen away as a practical political and social philosophy. Some seventy years later, this fact was exemplified most tellingly by the crushing defeat of George McGovern in his presidential bid of 1972. Consequently, the learning curve had moved through the twentieth century. At the beginning of a new millennium, the technocratic ethos viewed egalitarianism mainly in terms of access to higher education, and not more than that.

The metascript for the West had a full agenda at the turn of the century. The narcissistic culture of the West had to reach beyond its cultural limitations and address substantive issues related to the future of the global community. There were profound concerns over the future of much of the Third World, which was bedeviled not only by underdevelopment, but also by the ravages of ecological disaster and the public health emergency caused by HIV/AIDS. Sub-Saharan Africa, especially, faced multiple disasters related to economic bankruptcy, famine, civil war, and epidemic AIDS infection rates, as well as deforestation and desertification of the lands. There was a seemingly inexhaustible litany of potential disasters lurking in every corner of the world. Poverty, disease, war, and famine, the four horsemen of the apocalypse that John F. Kennedy named in his inaugural address, were astride the enormous continents of Africa and Asia

⁶¹³ *Tabb, Unequal Partners, 84–211.*

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

some forty years later. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the fast-developing Third World ICBMs threatened the redeemer nation. The crushing poverty of the “have not” nations surrounded the wealth and technological complexity of the developed world. There needed to be aggressive plans to redress these issues, and international institutions as well as American national security agencies moved to establish means for their long-term resolution. The educated American and European publics viewed the Third World as a catastrophe of growing, often-impossible proportions, and they were right. The question, though, was what combination of strategies would change the situation.⁶¹⁴

In this, the liberal script was fixed with concern for the agenda of international issues facing the world. Sustainable economic development was connected to global climate change and the protection of natural ecosystems, including the remaining tropical rainforests. In turn, those issues were related directly to human rights, democratic governments, and the overall modernization and liberalization of the underdeveloped world. All of this was deeply interconnected. Paramount, there remained the overriding concern for a stable and peaceful international system based upon neo-Wilsonian principles. Around the world, there was general agreement that the survival of humankind depended on economic development, the reduction of weapons of mass destruction, national self-determination, and the protection of global ecosystems. Logically, religious and ethnic warfare and the perpetuation of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes belied the primacy of the liberal technocratic civilization whose center, at the beginning of the century, remained the United States. Yet, the center of neo-Wilsonian ideology was no longer the redeemer nation. The drive to save the world through humanitarianism was a torch that had been passed more to Europeans and others concerned with the alleviation of human suffering through the disposition of foreign aid. The American role was now jaded. The country still sought its redemption, but it was a mission that was no longer defined by Christianity or the guilt inspired by the mass destruction of world war. The redeemer nation looked toward science and technology and business interests more than to Christian teachings for the engendering of a new age. The paradox was clear to observers of the international system. The country that modeled itself as the foundation for liberty and human freedom cared little as an institutional entity, even after its victory over communism, for humanitarian aid and development. Instead, the technocratic script defined by conservative economic thought and the business ideology of large corporations suggested a multinational corporate program for the protection of human rights and the development of democracy and sustainable economic development. Redemption, a public concern of the Roosevelts and the Kennedys, as well as Truman, Eisenhower, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, and Carter, was no longer of public but mainly of private interest in the new age. What united the Cold War and the post-Cold War was the machine.

⁶¹⁴ Bello, *Dark Victory*; James Morton, *The Poverty of Nations: The Dilemma at the Heart of Africa* (London: British Academic Press, 1994).

The Technocratic Machine

The heart of the new world was the technocratic machine of the twentieth century. The institutional systems of the twenty-first century and the epistemological systems of the same were expanding beyond the control of nation-states. The intellectual technology of the new scientific and engineering fields—nanotechnology, biotechnology, and artificial intelligence, to name just the most prominent—promised a radically different future than what could have been imagined half a century before. The exponential growth of knowledge identified by Alvin Toffler in his 1970 classic *Future Shock* accelerated even further with the arrival of the Internet and the World Wide Web in the 1990s. The concept of knowledge systems being self-organizing and expanding, exterior to human control or awareness, suggested the power of not only ideology but human consciousness by itself.⁶¹⁵

In the post–Cold War era, the technocratic machine, owned and devised by the Western script, builds institutions and knowledge systems at a dizzying pace. The complex of communication systems, personal computers, and interlocking networks of users suggests a world of almost indescribable change. The mass media, the Internet, and the expanding telephony of cellular phones and global fiber-optic long distance link a world of protean characteristics, augmented by the vast productivity of personal computers. In this new world, information processing can produce texts and calculations shared by millions of users who all communicate at something close to the speed of light. Modern technocratic civilization has become a global human environment of immense richness, one that necessarily copes with lightning change as a given.

In the contemporary technocratic period, formal knowledge systems operate through formal public and private institutions to govern markets, business, and government sectors. In developed societies, legal systems, medical knowledge and research, and the whole gamut of modern information appear to overwhelm the average citizen. Without question, the new age has produced a mega machine deserving of the name given by Lewis Mumford.⁶¹⁶ The technocratic machine threatens to turn all of reality into a collection of Web pages, electronic cameras, and PowerPoint presentations. As we have seen, the political, scientific, and business systems are all integrated into the new “wired world” of impermanence and mutability. The technocratic machine has embedded itself within the social and cultural systems of the United States. It has taken root in the other countries of the developed world, all tied by a dense interconnectedness between institutions and transnational knowledge systems. Technocratic institutions, most

⁶¹⁵ Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Random House, 1970), 136–93; Drexler, *Engines of Creation*, 64–82; David Fogel, *Evolutionary Computation: Toward a New Philosophy of Machine Intelligence* (New York: IEEE, 2000); Drew McDermott, *Mind and Mechanism* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001); Craig DeLancey, *Passionate Engines: What Emotions Reveal about Mind and Artificial Intelligence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Igor Aleksander, *How to Build a Mind* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2000).

⁶¹⁶ Mumford, *The Pentagon of Power*, 274–311.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

particularly large influential private corporations, are programmed to maintain the new ephemeral culture: a state of human consciousness that is transparent, facile, and indoctrinated by an addiction to consumerism. This liberal technocratic culture makes sanctimonious rhetoric about anything an exercise in absurdity.

The issues that present themselves to the world have as much to do with politics as they have with the machinations of technocratic civilization moving forward according to rules that transcend politics. In 1999, for example, in terms of the average observer in American society, there was little understanding of the strategic necessity for the Kosovo War. The sweeping attacks by NATO forces did nothing to elevate the West to a higher level of consciousness. Nor was there a great deal to advocate with regard to the ongoing conflicts in the Middle East in the early twenty-first century, or in other places in the world. To Americans, wars and crises had become spectacles of violence: a peculiar theater for those Americans and others who followed foreign affairs. The commercial, social, and cultural reality of postmodern, post-Cold War existence is the consciousness of a commercial technocratic age. The technocratic machine, built on organizations and the language of technocracies and technocratic disciplines, allows the public to float in this new reality. "In the future everyone will be famous for fifteen minutes," Andy Warhol had said many decades before. Indeed, that postmodern artistic vision was accurate.⁶¹⁷

A New Technocratic Order: Toward a Cybernetic Civilization

Futurology, a field that emerged in the 1960s, predicted exponential change in human technology. It would appear that the futurists of the 1960s had it right. The predictions of Toffler, Clarke, Roddenberry, Asimov, and innumerable others, that the near future would continue the path of the knowledge explosion, were correct. If the futurists of the early twenty-first century are correct, the cybernetic path will soon lead the world far into a new age in which nano-scale technologies will transform the technocratic symmetries of the present into infinitely greater and denser versions. The scientific revolution that began simply with the discovery of gravity and the heliocentric solar system, after little more than three and a half centuries now faces a reality that may soon transcend normal comprehension. The question is open with respect to the future of a post-technocratic world in which human activity, including human biology and its institutional and cultural systems, will no longer be bound by contemporary referents. It may be sooner rather than later, perhaps less than a century from now, that all the familiar categories related to human civilization will change. The nation-state, cities, ethnic groups, rituals of life, including birth, marriage, death, religion, and all the social and cultural referents for life in our age, will be subsumed and transcended by a civilization built on the silicon

⁶¹⁷Reva Wolf, Andy Warhol, Poetry, and Gossip in the 1960s (*Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997*); Kevin Kelly, *Out of Control: The New Biology of Machines, Social Systems, and the Economic World* (*Reading, MA: Perseus Books, 1994*).

transistors of the late twenty-first century. This new human or even posthuman age will be far beyond what may be comprehensible to our time.⁶¹⁸

The exponential expansion of technocratic knowledge and organization may empower humanity in ways that are merely suggested to us. However, the rule of all human history and the nature of humans as a species also suggests that the technological revolution will lead to a human existence fearfully transmogrified. The techniques of science and engineering built the modern world, from the clocks and sextants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the skyscrapers and subway tunnels of the early twentieth. In the twenty-first century, techniques will build information systems that will not only serve humankind but also, with little doubt, surpass it in every measurable form of intelligence. It is no longer fantastical to suggest that the logical consequence of the cybernetic revolution in science and engineering will be a posthuman society in which both human and natural environments will exist under the ubiquitous control of machine intelligence. Will humanity, as human beings understand the nature of their species, survive the twenty-first century? Will a new world be born beyond the imagination of even the most prescient futurologists?⁶¹⁹

We can expect that the relentless expansion of the technocratic modality will at some point, probably by the end of the century, but certainly within the next, reveal the script for humankind in its entirety. The epistemologies of the twenty-first century will reach a point of unification. That point may be understood, in its totality, only by machines with vast information processing speeds and capabilities. It may be that humans will surrender to super mechanical systems. The cybernetic revolution of the twenty-first century may be both the apotheosis and the demise of human civilization and humans as a biological species. The future may not belong to humans per se, but a synthetic descendant—the cyborg—as envisioned in science fiction.

In the cybernetic trans-human age, institutions as we understand them may not exist. Nor may the other elements of modern times, the narratives of human action and cognitive systems that I have termed epistemologies, be found in the post-technocratic epoch. Instead, these elements of humanness may be become subsumed under a higher architecture of sentient beings. The issues that have driven world history for thousands of years may no longer be meaningful in the final stage of the technocratic age. The technocratic systems of the posthuman era may be beyond the imagination of the species

⁶¹⁸N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); Catherine Waldby, *The Visible Human Project: Informatic Bodies and Posthuman Medicine* (New York: Routledge, 2000); Stanley Aronowitz, ed., *Technoscience and Cyberculture* (New York: Routledge, 1996); Mark Dery, *Escape Velocity: Cyberculture at the End of the Century* (New York: Grove Press, 1996); Pierre Levy, *Cyberculture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Alex Lightman, *Brave New Unwired World: The Digital Big Bang and the Infinite Internet* (New York: Wiley, 2002).

⁶¹⁹For “post-human” or “transhumanism,” see Cliff A. Joslyn, Francis Heylighen, and Valentin F. Turchin, “Metasystem Transition Theory,” *Principia Cybernetica Web*, <http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/MSTT.html>.

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

that originally created them. In this sense, the final path of science and technology in modern times may be a fundamental reckoning in which the other elements of human culture, specifically religion and humanistic knowledge, will come to terms with the end of life as we know it. The posthuman future of A.D. 2050 or 2100 or 2150 will define humankind in its final form. It may bring humans to another level of consciousness and civilization beyond all that we are familiar with.

Modern history began with the intellectual revolutions of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Enlightenment. Copernicus, Newton, Galileo, Locke, Rousseau, Smith, Jefferson, and Madison—the scientists and philosophers of the first period of modernity—envisioned a new world built on the knowledge that humans acquired through inquiry, experimentation, and free thought. After the eighteenth century, the nuclei of the industrial, scientific, and technological revolutions were planted by a relative handful of scholars and statesmen. In the technocratic age, the transmogrified intellectual technology of the European Enlightenment beckons humankind to an ethereal age of immeasurable horizons. The liberal technocratic narrative, in America and elsewhere in the international community of nations, summons the organization of knowledge to the service of the script. The world will change according to the scripted strictures of the global metanarrative. The international system will maintain order through the mechanisms of law and strategic deterrence, and the cultural dynamics of cosmopolitanism. The world will move through the coming century in a cascade of change. The entire spectrum of human life will come face to face with the machine. Everywhere, from the Pacific to the Atlantic, from the South Pole to the North Pole, the aggregation of thousands of cultures, histories, and political systems will render itself before the ultimate power of the technocratic pillars of the new world. The proffering will be voluntary only in the most formal sense. The final act of the modern script will bring humans to an epiphany about the very nature of humanness. In this penultimate climax to the expansion of the machine in human culture, no other in the world's history will compare.⁶²⁰

The end will come far sooner than most of us think. When it comes, the fundamental characteristics of human existence will lie in the balance. The nation-state will probably be no more, dissolved by the awesome forces of the future's machine age. The terms of reality that define human cultures will be challenged by the new reality of cybernetic intelligence far beyond the scope of human cognition. A three-dimensional world will become a world of infinite cognitive dimensions, as all of digitalized human culture will be comprehensible, synthesized, and compacted by the science of a future trans-human age. What is life and what is it to be human will be elemental questions at the end of human civilization. All who will care to weigh the past and the future of the human race will ponder these issues. At the end of the technocratic script, the technology will surpass its creator. The metascript will truly be messianic, looking at the power of machines—the invention of humankind transcending the biological.

⁶²⁰Kurzweil, *The Age of Spiritual Machines*, 234–60; Hans Moravec, *Robot: Mere Machine to Transcendent Mind* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 150–210.

At the edge of the new age, to what new Zion, Valhalla, heaven, or paradise—as it is variously known in many languages and cultures—will humans withdraw? Will they walk away from the technocratic script—or will they go forward into a truly new existence, a new reckoning beyond the human experience? To speak like a prophet from the Old Testament, “The day will come.” On that day, some will go, and others will stay. The script, the *techne* of the West, will end, and in the Hegelian philosophy of history, so too will historical time; no longer will the arguments of people have any meaning other than what they do to each other. The script and humankind will be history—nothing more, nothing less.⁶²¹

The End of the Script?

The final act in the script may come much sooner than most think. Within no more than fifty years, and perhaps before, the exponential development of advanced information systems suggests the development of machine intelligence beyond the domain of human cognition. The technocratic script will soon convert all of human culture and the physical universe into digitalized form. The final act of the technocratic may be its transcendence. The human world may soon be subsumed by the higher order of consciousness generated by artificial life forms. The epistemologies that structure the technocratic world may then generate a reality far beyond what we can comprehend as mere humans—biological beings, designed through evolution to think and feel but only in terms of the limits imposed by evolution’s architecture.

Futurists have begun to discuss the possible consequences of the transcendence of the machine. This has long been a theme of science fiction, but the vast distance between a fictional world of cyborgs and the potential for that reality to exist has narrowed dramatically. The course of technocratic development has moved to the molecular and atomic levels. Molecular-level control of physical systems and the development of molecular-level intelligence suggest that the human as a natural biological entity may have reached the absolute limits of its form. The next step, whether we approve or not, may be the convergence of biological and artificial intelligence, and ultimate transcendence of humans in an age in which machines, not people, rule. When the

⁶²¹ Alan Patten, Hegel’s *Idea of Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). To quote Hegel:

For that history is the exhibition of the divine, absolute development of Spirit in its highest forms—that gradation by which it attains its truth and consciousness of itself. The forms which these grades of progress assume are the characteristic “National Spirits” of History; the peculiar tenor of their moral life, of their Government, their Art, Religion, and Science. To realize these grades is the boundless impulse of the World-Spirit—the goal of its irresistible urging; for this division into organic members, and the full development of each, is its Idea. Universal History is exclusively occupied with showing how Spirit comes to a recognition and adoption of the Truth: the dawn of knowledge appears; it begins to discover salient principles, and at last it arrives at full consciousness. (Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Reason in History: A General Introduction to the Philosophy of History [1953; reprint, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1976])

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

machine no longer serves humankind, but transcends us, we may decide to transform ourselves into the higher order: to become artifacts of our own technology. In this way, the human age may end. The technocratic script, structured by the exigencies of human cultures—religions, languages, ethnic histories, art, poetry, politics, and economics—will disappear, subsumed by a new posthuman consciousness. Humans as we know them may exist, but only under the control of the new order. No longer sovereign or central and possibly extinct, the script will have reached its apotheosis, and a new age, beyond the imagining of its creators, will begin.

At that point, the paradox of the modern atlas will be solved. Rather than a hidden world shown in the digital photographs of continents from twenty thousand miles into space, the history of human civilization will be complete and will be observed historically, in its entirety. At the moment that human civilization is no longer defined by its biology, by the dynamic scripts that control the relationships between groups and cultures, human life will truly be history. It will be viewed clearly, transparent in its stages and passages to the present. Human history, at the apogee of the technocratic order, will be in a sense complete. It should be a coherent narrative with a beginning and an end, from the first agricultural settlements and writing systems in Neolithic times through the classical periods of the river valley civilizations, the Middle Ages, and, finally, to the periods of modern history in which we now witness the unification of all human groups for the first time since the species's origins many tens of thousands of years in the past. In modern Western history, the engines of Western rationalism propelled its civilization toward the technocratic age and the vast development of its scientifically based institutions and epistemologies. In this magnification of human capabilities, the paths of its diverse civilizations will be understood in the historical completeness of the global narrative.⁶²²

In modern Western history, the engines that propelled technology were tied to the self-interests of many groups, from economic and political elites to entire nation-states. The redeemer nation, product of the Western script, carried the metascript through the twentieth century. It imposed its own will on an international society that admired it, yet often felt betrayed and felt contempt for a country that followed its own interests. In the end, it will not matter how historians and social scientists interpret American or world history or the present period. The results will be the same no matter what method of historical analysis is used. In fifty years, perhaps, or a hundred, but certainly not much more than that, the technocratic script will have completed its cycle. The metascript that drove learning—from the ancient Greeks who invented rationalism and the ancient Hebrews who invented God to the multidimensional consciousness of modern times, with densely crowded cognitive space—that millennial script will be complete. True to the principles of the ancients, the technocratic will has brought humankind to understand itself at the most fundamental of levels. From the macro scale of global issues to the quantum nature of the universe, to the existential struggles of individuals confronted with their own particular crises, the summation of the technocratic will govern all. To this end,

⁶²² *Mazlish, The Fourth Discontinuity, 178–233; Mumford, The Pentagon of Power, 393–435.*

Plato was most certainly right: the unexamined life is not worth living. For the United States, self-defined redeemer of democracy and human progress, the script will surely be examined for its fulfillment of human aspirations. The country and its common culture, proud of its achievements and optimistic—a time-tested and proverbial national characteristic—would have it no other way. Will the rest of humanity, 95 percent of the human race, agree with the American interpretation? It should not matter. The American and the Western script will have run their course.

Index

- (SDI) Strategic Defense Initiative, 11, 67, 209, 220, 236, 308, 317
- Acheson, Dean, 34, 75, 200, 227, 230, 231, 234, 235, 250, 251, 260, 279
- Afghanistan, wars, 80, 211, 223, 269, 270, 284, 285, 286, 287, 298, 306, 309, 330
- AIDS, epidemic, 300, 331, 337
- America First Committee, 160
- American isolationism, 10, 36, 79, 100, 149, 151, 152, 153, 158, 159, 160, 171, 179, 181, 210
- American Revolution, 15, 16, 30, 31, 40, 50
- American script, 9, 34, 36, 40, 45, 60, 67, 76, 77, 78, 87, 90, 106, 107, 115, 153, 190, 212, 216, 230, 272, 315, 329, 330, 336
- Americanism, 23, 27, 28, 60, 79, 82, 106, 113, 133, 136, 181, 227, 230, 266, 286
- Bay of Pigs, 36, 268, 270
- Berlin Crises, 11, 40, 75, 210, 229, 245, 248, 249, 259, 260, 261, 262, 270, 281
- Berne, Eric, 34, 39, 42, 43
- Boulding, Kenneth, 59, 284, 289
- British Empire, 89, 103, 110, 172, 185, 196
- Brookings Institution, 37, 50, 53, 67, 73, 200, 207, 231, 235, 236, 281, 285, 286, 289, 298, 300, 306, 334
- Cambodian genocide, 283, 296
- capitalism, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 39, 40, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 67, 68, 78, 80, 81, 89, 93, 97, 118, 122, 123, 124, 130, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 146, 147, 149, 150, 157, 183, 207, 213, 217, 218, 224, 238, 239, 243, 253, 258, 271, 285, 288, 291, 294, 295, 306, 308, 310, 311, 312, 314, 315, 316, 320, 324, 325, 332, 333, 334
- Carter, James Earl, 11, 34, 208, 209, 267, 269, 270, 285, 286, 291, 298, 299, 307, 338
- Central Powers, 85, 92, 117, 118
- Chomsky, Noam, 29, 78, 208, 213, 221, 249, 289, 293, 321
- Churchill, Winston, 40, 71, 72, 133, 151, 154, 164, 176, 177, 178, 182, 183, 185, 187, 189, 190, 201, 215, 216, 260

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

- CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), 43, 65, 75, 77, 81, 226, 227, 231, 245, 256, 284, 304, 315
- Clinton, William Jefferson, 34, 64, 320, 335
- Cold War, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 82, 106, 131, 138, 156, 177, 183, 185, 188, 189, 191, 192, 197, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 280, 281, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 299, 300, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 324, 325, 327, 328, 329, 330, 334, 335, 336, 338, 339, 340
- Orthodoxy, 10, 208, 216, 244
- Warsaw Pact, 211, 244, 320
- Cold War epistemology, 222
- Cold War revisionism, 208, 285
- Committee on Public Information, 96, 117
- Committee on Public Inquiry, 119
- communist systems, 237, 287, 311
- containment, 10, 21, 22, 42, 44, 51, 53, 65, 68, 80, 82, 106, 206, 207, 210, 211, 212, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235, 237, 238, 240, 242, 244, 245, 246, 249, 254, 255, 256, 258, 262, 265, 266, 267, 268, 270, 274, 280, 286, 291, 307, 308, 311, 325, 334
- Coolidge, Calvin, 132, 149, 157
- corporate internationalism, 10, 51, 52, 79, 116, 127, 134, 135, 140, 157, 299, 335
- counterfactual history, 15, 18
- counterinsurgency, 53, 67, 77, 80, 211, 229, 237, 245, 263, 267, 274, 275, 277, 307, 309, 315, 319
- Cuban Missile Crisis, 11, 36, 40, 43, 70, 75, 76, 208, 229, 245, 249, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272
- Cummings, Bruce, 17, 20, 23, 44, 47, 51, 77, 80, 203, 206, 210, 221, 227, 235, 237, 250, 253, 254, 321
- cybernetic civilization, 340
- Dawes, Charles, 132
- De Gaulle, Charles, 182, 185, 187, 188
- domino theory, 225, 254, 255, 262
- dramaturgy, 26, 39, 43, 46, 62, 99, 162, 181, 185, 186, 270, 278
- Drexler, Eric, 290
- Einstein, Albert, 25, 94, 129, 135, 197
- Eisenhower, Dwight D., 53, 64, 75, 185, 216, 221, 227, 229, 230, 231, 236, 239, 245, 246, 247, 251, 255, 258, 260, 261, 262, 263, 267, 291, 338
- Enlightenment, 16, 29, 31, 43, 49, 53, 58, 73, 125, 133, 141, 327, 342
- epistemologies, 7, 24, 25, 26, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 57, 59, 67, 93, 95, 104, 127, 143, 176, 182, 191, 194, 195, 198, 199, 219, 221, 222, 232, 234, 235, 259, 274, 292, 293, 312, 321, 325, 327, 332, 341, 343, 344
- Falk, Richard, 41, 289, 333
- fascism, 47, 79, 84, 87, 97, 101, 122, 125, 126, 129, 133, 135, 140, 141, 142, 143, 147, 148, 152, 154, 155,

- 157, 163, 169, 182, 184, 188, 190,
208, 212, 215, 327
- feminism, 208, 292
- feminist theory, 292, 297
- First World War, 18, 23, 33, 39, 41, 50,
58, 65, 78, 79, 84, 86, 87, 91, 92,
95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102,
103, 104, 105, 115, 116, 124, 126,
131, 133, 134, 135, 137, 144, 151,
157, 158, 162, 180, 182, 186, 191,
194, 195, 203, 211, 214, 229, 234,
238, 271, 329
- Fourteen Points, 113, 114, 118, 125
- French empire, 71
- Freudian, 42, 293
- Friedman, Milton, 25, 60, 80, 207
- Fukuyama, Francis, 323, 324
- Gaddis, John Lewis, 20, 22, 23, 206,
210, 214, 233, 234, 235, 246, 266,
267, 270
- Galbraith, John Kenneth, 59, 289
- Geertz, Clifford, 14, 43, 99
- Globalization, 52, 68, 74, 131, 139, 146,
157, 320, 325, 328, 333
- Gorbachev, Mikhail, 36, 37, 221, 273,
304, 305, 306, 310, 316, 318, 319
- Grand Alliance, 154, 164, 177, 182,
188, 189, 192, 193, 194, 198, 201
- Great Depression, 10, 23, 36, 56, 79,
129, 130, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142,
146, 147, 148, 150, 154, 155, 161,
166, 172
- Great War, 9, 40, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90,
91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 103, 104, 105,
106, 108, 109, 113, 114, 118, 121,
123, 125, 137, 139, 140, 141, 146,
152, 158, 165, 170, 172, 191, 202
- Gulf War, 35, 40, 41, 251, 304, 312
- Harrington, Michael, 59, 289
- Hartz, Louis, 134
- Hiroshima and Nagasaki, atomic
bombings, 196, 198, 200, 205, 232,
234, 271
- Hitler, Adolf, 15, 18, 38, 40, 44, 45, 69,
71, 72, 104, 110, 120, 123, 126,
129, 132, 133, 135, 142, 143, 145,
146, 147, 148, 150, 151, 153, 154,
158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166,
167, 170, 171, 172, 176, 177, 178,
184, 185, 186, 187, 189, 192, 193,
197, 201, 210, 240, 251, 259
- Ho Chi Minh, 40, 255, 277
- Hobsbawm, Eric, 23, 57, 84, 95, 98, 99,
101, 102, 324
- Hoover, Herbert, 136, 149, 152, 153,
157
- imperialism, 9, 10, 20, 27, 39, 41, 52,
58, 79, 86, 95, 97, 98, 101, 102,
103, 113, 114, 136, 137, 138, 147,
158, 160, 162, 169, 184, 186, 190,
210, 214, 217, 245, 252, 261, 288,
293, 312
- intellectual technology, 24, 25, 49, 74,
84, 155, 156, 183, 206, 287, 333,
339, 342
- interwar period, 10, 100, 102, 126, 127,
129, 131, 133, 134, 137, 140, 141,
144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152,
153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159,
160, 163, 164, 167, 168, 171, 178,
214, 232, 234, 238
- Iranian hostage crisis, 269, 285, 296,
298, 309
- Islamic revolution, fundamentalism,
211, 269, 286, 300
- Japanese empire, 141, 181, 215
- Japanese imperialism, 168
- Johnson, Lyndon, 28, 36, 67, 225, 238,
239, 241, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270,
273, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280,
281, 287, 338

Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present

- Joint Chiefs of Staff, 54, 177, 240, 250, 251, 256
- Judeo-Christian, 26, 29, 39, 55, 57, 59, 227
- Kennan, George, 34, 229, 234, 235, 279
- Kennedy, John F., 28, 36, 44, 46, 47, 70, 71, 75, 76, 210, 216, 221, 225, 227, 229, 230, 238, 239, 245, 246, 248, 260, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 280, 281, 285, 286, 298, 330, 337
- Keynes, John Maynard, 25, 51, 135
- Keynesian, 51, 55, 80, 229, 238, 239, 267, 293, 325, 334
- Khrushchev, Nikita, 71, 76, 207, 210, 245, 248, 259, 260, 265, 269, 270, 271, 272
- Kissinger, Henry, 37, 75, 104, 186, 235, 236, 240, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 324
- Korean War, 10, 17, 40, 44, 75, 106, 210, 211, 213, 223, 229, 230, 231, 235, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 260, 269, 285, 304, 336
- League of Nations, 114, 119, 125, 126, 127, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 139, 143, 145, 147, 154, 155, 164, 199
- Leffler, Melvyn, 22
- Lenin, Vladimir, 15, 18, 40, 68, 97, 101, 122, 123, 124, 126, 138, 139, 165, 166, 207, 212, 259, 281, 310
- liberal technocratic, 26, 41, 54, 60, 61, 77, 84, 122, 127, 182, 224, 234, 235, 285, 325, 326, 337, 340, 342
- Lindbergh, Charles, 136, 152
- Lippmann, Walter, 34, 180, 229
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, 238, 284
- MacArthur, Douglas, 250, 251
- Mahan, Alfred T., 79, 106, 116
- Manhattan Project, 10, 197, 198
- Mao Zedong, 36, 37, 40, 206, 211, 227, 250, 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 281, 300, 319
- Marcuse, Herbert, 293
- Marshall Plan, 10, 15, 21, 51, 61, 233, 242, 243, 244, 330
- Marx, Karl, 19, 25, 68, 85, 94, 122, 123, 129, 138, 207, 212, 281, 332
- Marxism-Leninism, 51, 97, 122, 124, 126, 138, 142, 157, 163, 191, 206, 209, 210, 211, 212, 214, 217, 258, 262, 281, 288, 298, 304, 311, 314, 315, 316, 319, 320, 325, 333
- McCarthyism, 215, 240, 241, 249, 263
- metascript, 10, 27, 34, 40, 41, 45, 52, 55, 57, 60, 63, 69, 70, 73, 74, 79, 94, 102, 106, 108, 125, 139, 140, 141, 148, 154, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 203, 206, 210, 211, 212, 214, 223, 228, 248, 263, 264, 270, 305, 309, 317, 318, 321, 325, 326, 337, 342, 344
- metascripts, 9, 26, 36, 37, 46, 69, 74, 188, 326
- Mills, C. Wright, 216, 293
- modernization theory, 53, 67, 214, 222, 238, 239
- monetarist, 51, 130, 325
- Morgenthau, Hans, 184, 186, 188, 229
- multinational corporation, 54, 63, 64
- Mumford, Lewis, 24, 26, 53, 54, 339, 344
- Munich Pact, 10, 146, 165, 170, 177, 178, 240, 269
- Mussolini, Benito, 135, 140, 142, 152, 157, 163, 165, 170, 171, 177, 201
- Nader, Ralph, 59, 289
- nanotechnology, 25, 30, 74, 290, 291, 323, 332, 333, 339
- Napoleon, 24, 109, 142
- NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration), 62, 63

- national scripts, 35, 37, 40, 46, 48, 54,
69, 70, 88, 96, 143, 148, 168, 170,
171, 175, 182, 185, 195, 211, 265
national security culture, 287, 289
national security institutions, 54, 66,
180, 238, 307
national security state, 9, 10, 21, 53, 63,
65, 67, 68, 80, 108, 115, 182, 191,
193, 200, 203, 210, 269, 274, 285,
330, 331, 334, 335
National Socialism, 44, 93, 97, 101,
120, 132, 141, 143, 144, 145, 148,
163, 165, 167, 171, 190, 201
National Socialist ideology, 163, 171
nationalism, 9, 76, 86, 92, 97, 98, 99,
101, 111
nationalist scripts, 98
NATO (North Atlantic Treaty
Organization), 211, 233, 236, 243,
244, 255, 305, 309, 310, 331, 340
New Deal, 38, 47, 48, 149, 150, 158,
159, 180, 200, 239, 243
New Left, 41, 64, 291
New York Times, 160, 181, 216, 250,
289
Niebuhr, Reinhold, 225
Nixon, Richard, 11, 36, 37, 64, 67, 208,
222, 239, 240, 263, 268, 269, 272,
275, 276, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283,
287, 297, 338
OPEC (Organization of Petroleum
Exporting Countries), 56, 60, 285,
286, 297
orthodox script, 216, 232, 236, 239,
241, 244, 248, 249, 250, 267, 273,
274, 281, 298
Pearl Harbor, 15, 36, 79, 136, 144, 146,
149, 153, 154, 159, 160, 161, 173,
177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 240, 241,
269, 271
Polyani, Karl, 58
post-Cold War, 81, 223, 319, 321, 324,
335
post-technocratic, 32, 340
Reagan, Ronald, 11, 28, 34, 36, 37, 40,
51, 63, 64, 67, 77, 78, 80, 208, 209,
221, 239, 281, 287, 295, 298, 299,
300, 301, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309,
310, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318,
319, 320, 321
redeemer nation, 7, 26, 40, 41, 55, 60,
61, 63, 76, 80, 81, 90, 112, 125,
133, 152, 158, 171, 172, 176, 179,
182, 183, 190, 199, 200, 201, 210,
214, 218, 219, 223, 226, 250, 257,
269, 277, 280, 281, 284, 285, 288,
324, 329, 330, 338, 344
Reykjavik summit, 305
Ridgeway, Matthew, 251
Roosevelt, Franklin, 27, 33, 36, 38, 40,
45, 65, 79, 126, 133, 149, 150, 151,
153, 154, 157, 158, 160, 161, 165,
171, 172, 176, 177, 179, 181, 182,
183, 185, 186, 187, 189, 190, 197,
200, 201, 230, 239, 243, 286, 299,
330
Roosevelt, Theodore, 78, 79, 88, 106,
116, 117, 291
Rostow, Walt, 34, 60, 238, 239, 266,
270
Russian Revolution, 18, 93, 97, 121,
122, 123
Russian script, 121
Schlesinger, Arthur, 34, 36, 266
scripts, 9, 26, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43,
68, 72, 76, 148, 154, 155, 182, 251
corporate script, 149
German script, 69, 103, 161, 259
isolationist script, 151
Korean script, 252
SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative), 11,
67, 209, 220, 308, 316, 317, 318,
319

*Redeemer Nation
America and the World in the Technocratic Age
1914 to the Present*

- Second World War, 15, 23, 48, 50, 58,
59, 62, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72,
75, 79, 87, 129, 131, 133, 140, 141,
142, 144, 145, 146, 149, 150, 153,
154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 165, 166,
167, 170, 172, 175, 176, 177, 178,
180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188,
189, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 197,
198, 199, 202, 203, 205, 207, 210,
211, 214, 215, 216, 218, 220, 225,
227, 229, 230, 231, 234, 236, 238,
239, 250, 251, 252, 254, 265, 270,
277, 297, 299, 313, 324
- September 11 (attacks), 11, 52, 55, 81,
330, 331
- socialism, 39, 47, 48, 51, 64, 67, 71, 91,
93, 97, 124, 135, 137, 138, 139,
142, 151, 164, 166, 167, 171, 207,
212, 213, 217, 218, 219, 224, 252,
253, 258, 281, 300, 303, 308, 309,
310, 311, 312, 315, 316, 319, 320,
324, 328, 334
- Soviet bloc, 183, 206, 207, 224, 227,
300, 303, 304, 306, 309, 310, 311,
312, 314, 320, 324, 333
- Soviet Union, 10, 37, 44, 47, 54, 59, 63,
66, 73, 75, 97, 122, 123, 124, 126,
131, 132, 133, 138, 139, 141, 142,
145, 153, 154, 159, 163, 164, 165,
166, 167, 168, 170, 172, 175, 176,
177, 178, 179, 182, 186, 187, 188,
189, 193, 199, 200, 203, 206, 207,
208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 215, 220,
221, 224, 226, 233, 235, 236, 244,
247, 248, 252, 255, 258, 260, 262,
264, 265, 270, 271, 273, 281, 287,
288, 300, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308,
311, 313, 314, 315, 316, 319, 320,
329, 334, 335
- Sputnik, 224, 247, 262
- Stalin, Joseph, 15, 23, 40, 47, 122, 123,
126, 131, 132, 133, 135, 142, 144,
154, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 171,
172, 176, 177, 182, 185, 187, 189,
190, 193, 199, 201, 207, 210, 211,
215, 224, 227, 249, 250, 251, 252,
259, 273, 288
- technocratic, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, 23, 24, 25,
26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 39, 40, 41,
47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56,
57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66,
67, 68, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80,
81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 92, 93, 94, 95,
96, 97, 98, 103, 104, 106, 109, 110,
113, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121,
122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 129, 130,
131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138,
139, 140, 143, 145, 147, 148, 149,
151, 154, 156, 157, 162, 163, 165,
167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177,
180, 182, 183, 188, 189, 190, 191,
194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 202, 203,
206, 208, 209, 210, 212, 214, 215,
217, 218, 219, 221, 222, 223, 224,
232, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239,
241, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248,
250, 254, 255, 259, 260, 266, 268,
270, 272, 273, 274, 281, 282, 285,
287, 289, 290, 291, 292, 294, 295,
299, 304, 307, 308, 312, 313, 314,
317, 319, 320, 321, 324, 325, 326,
327, 328, 329, 331, 332, 333, 334,
335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341,
342, 343, 344
- technocratic epistemologies, 25, 47, 194
- technocratic epistemology, 47
- technocratic knowledge, 10, 25, 47, 83,
234, 239
- Tet offensive, 11, 40, 70, 80, 269, 276,
277, 278, 279
- Third Reich, 10, 38, 45, 79, 131, 133,
140, 141, 143, 144, 147, 153, 154,
160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166,
167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 176, 177,

- 178, 179, 184, 185, 190, 192, 198,
201, 215, 225, 259
- Toffler, Alvin, 339, 340
- totalitarianism, 39, 74, 122, 123, 126,
132, 133, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142,
146, 147, 148, 150, 154, 157, 158,
161, 163, 166, 168, 169, 171, 172,
178, 187, 188, 189, 207, 212, 214,
225, 226, 227, 252, 259, 288, 303,
309, 312, 314, 319, 327, 328, 335,
338
- Truman, Harry, 21, 22, 44, 75, 187,
189, 210, 212, 215, 221, 225, 229,
230, 231, 232, 233, 235, 236, 239,
245, 249, 250, 251, 257, 260, 261,
299, 338
- Tuchman, Barbara, 40, 83, 84, 86, 93,
98, 101
- United Nations, 45, 66, 71, 186, 189,
199, 200, 230, 231, 233, 251, 329,
334
- Versailles, Treaty of, 42, 79, 99, 102,
114, 118, 119, 120, 121, 124, 125,
126, 136, 137, 145, 146, 147, 154,
156, 164, 167, 170, 177
- Vietnam War, 11, 21, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40,
41, 43, 44, 53, 63, 65, 67, 75, 76,
77, 80, 106, 139, 183, 193, 208,
211, 217, 223, 225, 227, 228, 229,
230, 231, 240, 241, 246, 249, 251,
253, 254, 255, 256, 258, 260, 262,
263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269,
270, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278,
279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285,
286, 289, 290, 291, 293, 295, 296,
307, 318, 321, 330
- Diem, Ngo Dinh, 230, 256, 268, 274
- Indochina, 11, 75, 208, 213, 217,
244, 245, 248, 250, 251, 254, 255,
262, 273, 274, 277, 281, 283, 288,
296
- Vietnam War, Gulf of Tonkin, 208, 274
- War Industries Board, 108, 115, 117,
191
- War Resources Board, 196
- Washington, George, 16, 18, 90, 111,
152, 159, 179
- Watergate crisis, 280, 281, 296, 297
- Weimar Republic, 126, 145, 148, 150,
151, 157, 161, 164, 167
- Wilhelm, Kaiser, 86, 96, 171
- Williams, William Appelman, 293
- Wilson, Woodrow, 23, 27, 28, 33, 40,
42, 65, 78, 82, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92,
105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111,
112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118,
119, 120, 121, 125, 126, 127, 131,
133, 134, 137, 145, 147, 153, 158,
179, 218, 228, 229, 230, 286, 288,
299, 318, 329, 330
- Wilsonian internationalism, 23, 28, 41,
42, 68, 76, 77, 79, 82, 86, 91, 107,
108, 112, 114, 115, 116, 125, 127,
131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 139, 142,
149, 152, 154, 156, 157, 160, 173,
179, 180, 199, 229, 230, 232, 233,
234, 243, 260, 264, 267, 273, 276,
286, 287, 288, 329, 335, 336, 338
- Zion, American Zionism, 29, 30, 60, 77,
159, 281

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the American Book Publishing Company for undertaking the publication of this work. In an age of economic hardship for academic publishing, to be willing to issue a volume of such ambition from a relatively unknown historian represents a certain boldness and courage not characteristic of commercial presses.

The university and public libraries that have assisted my work over the years have been essential to the task of completing this study. In particular, the University of Chicago libraries, the New York Public Library, St. Johns University library, and Columbia University library were vital sources for bibliographic research. As with my dissertation, the faith and support of family and friends allowed me to move forward with this work with no obvious reward at its end. Once again, I need to pay tribute to my late father, who lectured me on the importance of persistence and hard work. No doubt that most important lesson established the basis for this scholarship.

About the Author

Orrin Schwab is the author of *Defending the Free World: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson and the Vietnam War, 1961–1965* (Praeger, 1998). He is an independent scholar who lives in the New York metropolitan area. He earned a doctorate in history from the University of Chicago in 1993.